

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, April 16, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 11354. An act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903; and

H. R. 12536. An act to further amend section 2399 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 181. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. David;

S. 201. An act granting a pension to Jane K. Hill;

S. 721. An act granting an increase of pension to Lavalette D. Dickey;

S. 951. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Ambrook;

S. 952. An act granting an increase of pension to George H. Smith;

S. 1285. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Steele;

S. 1678. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Wingfield;

S. 2063. An act granting a pension to Ida S. McKinley;

S. 2079. An act granting an increase of pension to William Wheeler;

S. 2327. An act granting an increase of pension to William Hoag;

S. 2329. An act granting an increase of pension to Peter Bittman;

S. 2877. An act to remove the charge of desertion standing against the record of Thomas Blackburn;

S. 3064. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma Sophia Harper Cilley;

S. 3103. An act granting an increase of pension to Susan Hays;

S. 3378. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah Anne Harris;

S. 3388. An act granting an increase of pension to John Peterson;

S. 3390. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Allen;

S. 3849. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. H. Luce;

S. 3995. An act granting a pension to Susan E. Cleark;

S. 4022. An act granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Brown;

S. 4404. An act granting an increase of pension to Otto H. Haselman;

S. 4414. An act granting an increase of pension to Albertine Schoenecker; and

S. 4643. An act granting an increase of pension to Phoebe L. Peyton.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 12765); and pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be closed on Friday at 3 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12765; and pending that, also asks unanimous consent that general debate upon this bill be closed on Friday next at 3 o'clock p. m. Is there objection?

Mr. TAWNEY. I would like to ask my colleague if it would not be possible to incorporate with his request a proposition to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow and Friday.

Mr. PAYNE. I would have no objection to that myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York amends his request, and asks that the sessions of the House to-morrow and Friday commence at 11 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement. Inasmuch as there has been some division on this side of the House as well as on the other side on this proposition, I want to make this statement, Mr. Speaker. I shall not object to this request, but I want to notify all gentlemen on this side of my position, because if any other gentleman desires to object he may do so. Now, Mr. Speaker, when this bill was taken up the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] asked to

close this general debate—it was taken up on Tuesday of last week—he asked to close general debate—

Mr. PAYNE. On Friday of last week.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee (continuing). On Friday of last week, as I remember. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON], one of the strongest opposers of the bill on this side of the House, suggested to him to close it on yesterday. That was Tuesday—one week of debate—and to that the gentleman from New York himself objected.

Mr. PAYNE. I wish right there to say—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I am not finding fault. So that we have had a longer time than the gentleman from Louisiana asked for the general debate. Now, as I understand it, the gentleman comes and is willing to continue debate until Friday evening at 3 o'clock. In order that all gentlemen may understand it, I make this statement, and so far as I am concerned, I am satisfied with the general debate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I object to the request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi objects.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that general debate close on Friday at 3 o'clock, and on that I demand the previous question.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that general debate close on Friday at 3 o'clock, and on that demands the previous question.

The question on ordering the previous question was put; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Several MEMBERS. Division!

Mr. BARTLETT. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I desire to know whether this is on the previous question, or what is it on?

The SPEAKER. The vote is on ordering the previous question.

The House divided; and the Speaker announced 103 in the affirmative.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Can I not withdraw the objection?

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not entertain a parliamentary inquiry pending a vote.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The gentleman states he wishes to withdraw his objection, and if that is done it will obviate the whole trouble.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must call the attention of the House to the fact that it is in the midst of a vote, and the gentleman will have to ask unanimous consent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings be vacated and that the suggestion made by the gentleman from New York be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the present proceedings be vacated and that the request of the gentleman from New York be agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Those opposed to ordering the previous question will rise. Ninety-nine votes in the negative. On this question the yeas are 103 and the nays 99. The ayes have it, and the previous question is ordered.

The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from New York to limit general debate to 3 o'clock p. m. on Friday next.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAY) there were yeas 107, noes 120.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 153, nays 124, answered "present" 8, not voting 70; as follows:

YEAS—153.

Acheson,	Butler, Pa.	Griggs,	Lawrence,
Adams,	Candler,	Grosvenor,	Lessler,
Adamson,	Cannon,	Grow,	Lever,
Allen, Ky.	Clayton,	Hanbury,	Lewis, Pa.
Allen, Me.	Conner,	Haskins,	Littauer,
Ball, Del.	Cooper, Wis.	Hemenway,	Long,
Bankhead,	Crumpacker,	Henry, Conn.	McCall,
Barney,	Currier,	Henry, Miss.	McClellan,
Bartholdt,	Curtis,	Hill,	McLain,
Bartlett,	Dalzell,	Hitt,	Mahon,
Bates,	Davidson,	Holliday,	Mann,
Beidler,	Deemer,	Howard,	Marshall,
Bingham,	Douglas,	Howell,	Martin,
Blackburn,	Driscoll,	Hull,	Mercer,
Boutell,	Elliott,	Irwin,	Mickey,
Bowersock,	Emerson,	Jenkins,	Miller,
Bowie,	Feely,	Johnson,	Mondell,
Brantley,	Foerderer,	Jones, Va.	Moody, N. C.
Brick,	Foss,	Joy,	Moody, Oreg.
Bristow,	Foster, Vt.	Kehoe,	Morgan,
Brownlow,	Fowler,	Ketcham,	Morrill,
Bull,	Fox,	Klutz,	Moss,
Burke, S. Dak.	Gaines, W. Va.	Knapp,	Mudd,
Burkett,	Gibson,	Knox,	Nevin,
Burnleigh,	Gillet, N. Y.	Kyle,	Olmsted,
Burnett,	Gillett, Mass.	Lacey,	Otjen,
Burton,	Graff,	Landis,	Overstreet,

Parker,	Schirm,	Sulloway,	Wadsworth,
Patterson, Pa.	Scott,	Tawney,	Wanger,
Payne,	Shattuc,	Taylor, Ohio	Warnock,
Pou,	Sibley,	Taylor, Ala.	Watson,
Powers, Mass.	Skiles,	Thomas, Iowa	Wheeler,
Pugsley,	Smith, Iowa	Thompson,	Wiley,
Ray, N. Y.	Southard,	Tirrell,	Williams, Miss.
Reeves,	Southwick,	Tompkins, Ohio	Wilson,
Richardson, Ala.	Sperry,	Tongue,	Woods,
Roberts,	Spight,	Underwood,	
Russell,	Stewart, N. J.	Vreeland,	
Scarborough,	Storm,	Wachter,	

NAYS—124.

Aplin,	Dougherty,	Lloyd,	Robb,
Ball, Tex.	Edwards,	Loud,	Robertson, La.
Bell,	Esch,	McAndrews,	Robinson, Ind.
Bishop,	Fitzgerald,	McCleary,	Robinson, Nebr.
Brenzeale,	Fleming,	McCulloch,	Rucker,
Bromwell,	Fletcher,	McDermott,	Selby,
Broussard,	Flood,	McLachlan,	Shackleford,
Brown,	Fordney,	McRae,	Shallenberger,
Brundidge,	Foster, Ill.	Maddox,	Shelden,
Burgess,	Gaines, Tenn.	Mahoney,	Sims,
Burleson,	Gardner, Mich.	Maynard,	Smith, Ill.
Butler, Mo.	Gilbert,	Metcalf,	Smith, Ky.
Caldwell,	Gooch,	Meyer, La.	Smith, H. C.
Cassingham,	Griffith,	Miers, Ind.	Smith, S. W.
Clark,	Hamilton,	Minor,	Snodgrass,
Cochran,	Hay,	Moon,	Snook,
Conry,	Heatwole,	Morris,	Sparkman,
Coombs,	Hepburn,	Mutcher,	Stark,
Cooney,	Hooker,	Needham,	Stephens, Tex.
Corliss,	Jackson, Kans.	Neville,	Stevens, Minn.
Cowherd,	Jackson, Md.	Norton,	Sutherland,
Creamer,	Jones, Wash.	Otey,	Swanson,
Crowley,	Kern,	Padgett,	Talbert,
Cushman,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Patterson, Tenn.	Tate,
Dahle,	Kleberg,	Pierce,	Thomas, N. C.
Darragh,	Lamb,	Prince,	Vandiver,
Davey, La.	Lanham,	Ransdell, La.	Warner,
Davis, Fla.	Lindsay,	Reid,	Weeks,
De Armond,	Little,	Rhea, Va.	White,
Dick,	Littlefield,	Richardson, Tenn.	Williams, Ill.
Dinsmore,	Livingston,	Rixey,	Zenor.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—8.

Belmont,	Finley,	Lewis, Ga.	Thayer,
Capron,	Hall,	Showalter,	Van Voorhis.

NOT VOTING—70.

Alexander,	Eddy,	Kahn,	Ryan,
Babcock,	Evans,	Kitchin, Claude	Salmon,
Bellamy,	Gardner, N. J.	Lassiter,	Shafroth,
Benton,	Gill,	Latimer,	Sheppard,
Blakeney,	Glenn,	Lester,	Sherman,
Boreing,	Goldfogle,	Loudenslager,	Slayden,
Burk, Pa.	Gordon,	Loving,	Small,
Calderhead,	Graham,	Moody, Mass.	Smith, Wm. Alden
Cassel,	Green, Pa.	Naphen,	Steele,
Connell,	Greene, Mass.	Newlands,	Stewart, N. Y.
Cooper, Tex.	Haugen,	Palmer,	Sulzer,
Cousins,	Hedge,	Pearre,	Tompkins, N. Y.
Cromer,	Henry, Tex.	Perkins,	Trimble,
Cummings,	Hildebrandt,	Powers, Me.	Wooten,
Dayton,	Hopkins,	Randell, Tex.	Wright,
De Graffenreid,	Hughes,	Reeder,	Young.
Dovener,	Jack,	Rumple,	
Draper,	Jett,	Ruppert,	

So the motion of Mr. PAYNE was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

For the session:

Mr. KAHN with Mr. BELMONT.

Mr. BOREING with Mr. TRIMBLE.

Mr. YOUNG with Mr. BENTON.

Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. HALL.

Until further notice:

Mr. VAN VOORHIS with Mr. GORDON.

Mr. CAPRON with Mr. JETT.

Mr. EDDY with Mr. SHEPPARD.

Mr. SHOWALTER with Mr. SLAYDEN.

Mr. STEELE with Mr. COOPER of Texas.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts with Mr. NAPHEN.

Mr. JACK with Mr. FINLEY.

Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. CUMMINGS.

Mr. HEDGE with Mr. SMALL.

For this day:

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. SALMON.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. RANDELL of Texas.

Mr. HOPKINS with Mr. LESTER.

Mr. GILL with Mr. LATIMER.

Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. RUPPERT.

Mr. COUSINS with Mr. BELLAMY.

Mr. REEDER with Mr. HENRY of Texas.

Mr. CONNELL with Mr. WOOTEN.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN.

Mr. DOVENER with Mr. NEWLANDS.

Mr. DRAPER with Mr. RYAN.

Mr. HILDEBRANT with Mr. SULZER.

Mr. RUMPLE with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania with Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. DE GRAFFENREID.

For this vote:

Mr. EVANS with Mr. LASSITER.

Mr. DAYTON with Mr. GLENN.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. SHAFROTH.

Mr. LOVERING with Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

On this bill except final passage:

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts with Mr. THAYER.

Mr. BELMONT. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no" on the roll call. I find I am announced as paired. I therefore withdraw my vote and wish to be recorded as "present."

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. As I am paired with my colleague, Mr. GORDON, who is absent this morning, I desire to withdraw my vote and be recorded as "present."

Mr. CAPRON. Being paired with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. JETT, I wish to withdraw my vote and be recorded "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

HOUR OF MEETING FOR NEXT TWO DAYS.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent that the House meet to-morrow and Friday at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BUSINESS OF COMMITTEE ON WAR CLAIMS.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, to-morrow was set apart by unanimous consent for the business of the Committee on War Claims. In order to obviate any parliamentary difficulty, and so that the debate on the pending bill may go on, I ask that next Tuesday be substituted for business of our committee.

The SPEAKER. The chairman of the Committee on War Claims [Mr. MAHON] asks that next Tuesday be set apart for the consideration of business from that committee. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

RECIPROCITY WITH CUBA.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 12765.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. SHERMAN in the chair, and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12765) to provide for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state that in view of the limitation which the House has put upon debate on this bill, and in consideration of the number of gentlemen who have asked an opportunity to speak, it will be impossible for the Chair to recognize any gentleman for an hour. If the time that the Chair may allot to any of the various gentlemen who are to speak should be extended, it must be with the distinct understanding that the extension will probably exclude some member from the privilege of speaking who would otherwise be enabled to speak. Should extensions of time be asked, it will be for each member to understand that the extension in favor of one gentleman may shut out some other. The Chair thinks it fair to make this statement before the debate begins, so that every member of the House may act accordingly. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] is recognized for forty-five minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, by way of preface to my remarks, and in order that my attitude toward the existing tariff law may not be misconstrued or misunderstood here or elsewhere, I desire to say to the committee that I am a strong and I trust a consistent believer in the theory of protecting against the competition of foreign products and foreign labor every American industry, manufacturer, or laborer in need of protection. If a high rate of duty is necessary to accomplish this, I am for the high rate; if a low rate of duty will serve the purpose, I am for the low rate. If the free entry of any product or article will not diminish American wages or restrict the American production of that article, I am for placing that product or article upon the free list and giving the benefit of lower prices to the many rather than imposing a tariff on it for the benefit of the few who invariably profit by such conditions. So much for my personal views and attitude on the policy of protection.

Almost from the fall of the Speaker's gavel at the beginning of this session of Congress our ears have been assailed with frantic appeals for action in behalf of poor, distressed Cuba. Those appeals have come from the corridor, the lobby, the committee room, the floor of the House, the press of the country, and have grown more and more frantic as the days have passed, until the cry is now almost hysterical. Certain gentlemen on the floor of this House and many newspapers throughout the country are greatly agitated and disturbed over the financial and physical condition of our wards in the island of Cuba; and they propose to cut our tariff in order that those wards may be insured peace, plenty, prosperity, and consequent happiness.

I have listened to all these arguments, entreaties, appeals, and supplications with close interest, fondly hoping that I might hear some faint, feeble word of encouragement held out to our own people along the line of tariff reduction in their interest. But thus far I have strained my ear drums in vain. Apparently the programme is to help Porto Rico, help Hawaii, help the Philippines, help Cuba, help everybody on God's green footstool except the people unfortunate enough to live in the United States. For them the Dingley rates, now and forever.

The Dingley bill was a wonderfully conceived piece of constructive legislation, and has accomplished truly wonderful results in restoring prosperity to a country that had been prostrated in an attempt to conform itself to Democratic notions of and experiments on a tariff policy. But great as was that bill and marvelous as were the results obtained under its provisions, neither its greatness nor its results are sufficient to make of it a deity before whom the American people must forever bow their heads nor dare lift their eyes to the face of their god, much less to question his imperious will.

At its inception the Dingley bill was far from perfect, and was so admitted by some of its warmest friends. The rates imposed by many of its schedules were much higher than were necessary to adequately protect American capital and labor, and in one instance at least, which I shall later point out, no duty whatever should have been imposed. The article should have remained on the free list, where it had been from the foundation of the Government, except for a period of about thirty years between 1842 and 1872. I refer to the tariff on hides of cattle, which, so far as concerns both the manufacturer and workman of the United States, are and always must be classed as raw material. During this great outburst of generosity on the part of Congress toward the people of Cuba I propose to test Congressional magnanimity toward good, plain, honest, everyday American citizens by coupling with our gift to Cuba a wee, little, tiny crumb of comfort to our own people, which is embodied in an amendment to the pending bill which at the proper time I shall offer and which I now send to the desk to be read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add a new paragraph—
"Sec. 2. That on and after the passage of this act the raw or uncured hides of cattle, whether the same be dry, salted, or pickled, shall, when imported, be exempt from duty.
"Paragraph 437, Schedule N, of the act entitled 'An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States,' approved July 24, 1897, is hereby repealed."

Mr. ROBERTS. When the bill now under consideration and discussion by the committee came before the House a week ago last Tuesday, on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Speaker of this House twice ruled that it was a bill affecting the revenues, and as such gained its privileged status. I assume the chairman of this committee, himself a sound and able parliamentarian, will follow the precedent established by our distinguished and learned Speaker, whose knowledge of parliamentary law and procedure is second to that of none of his illustrious predecessors, and if called upon to rule on that question will rule that, this being a bill affecting the revenues, any amendment that affects the revenues will be in order. Upon this assumption I shall address the remainder of my remarks to reasons why the amendment I shall offer later should be adopted.

A little history as to the tariff on hides may not be out of place at this point. From the foundation of the Government down to the year 1842 no one ever thought of placing a duty on hides. In that year, by reason of a deficit in the Treasury, brought about by Executive veto of two tariff bills, it became necessary to raise money to cover that deficit, and so for the first time hides were taxed the enormous rate of 5 per cent ad valorem. That tax remained until 1857, when it was reduced to 4 per cent, and it continued at 4 per cent until March, 1861, when it was restored to 5 per cent. Six months later, in August, 1861, when it became necessary to raise money to carry on our great civil war, the duty was increased to 10 per cent ad valorem. That was a time when everything in sight was taxed, and when light and air would have been taxed could they have been measured or their value computed.

The duty remained at 10 per cent from 1861, owing to the exigencies of the Government, until 1872, when hides were again placed on the free list.

There were many tariff revisions subsequent to that of 1872, among them the McKinley bill, which had protection for its corner stone, but in none of those bills was a penny of tariff levied on hides.

In 1897 it was proposed to once more tax hides and every other description of skins except fur skins 25 per cent ad valorem; but when the smoke of battle had cleared away it was discovered that all other skins had escaped the Dingley drag net except hides of cattle, and they were entangled in its meshes with a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem—a duty three times greater than when the country needed money to make up a deficit in the Treasury, and

50 per cent greater than when the country was resorting to every expedient to raise money to carry on our great civil war.

Prior to 1897 hides and every description of skins had been on the free list seventy-eight years in all, and for about thirty years has been taxed from 4 to 10 per cent. When taxed at all, hides and all manner of skins were taxed equally. The tax bore on all alike. There was no discrimination. The Dingley bill was the first legislation in the history of the United States to make a distinction between hides of cattle and hides of other animals, taxing the former and leaving the latter on the free list where all should have been left. Why was this unjust discrimination made? Was it to produce revenue? Let us see. Under the operations of this bill there have been imported into the United States in the last four years hides and skins to the value of \$185,212,686. Of this amount \$123,910,121 or over two-thirds in value came in free of duty, leaving \$61,300,565 upon which a 15 per cent tariff was levied.

Clearly hides of cattle were not singled out for their revenue-producing capacity. Was it to protect the American producer of hides and skins? If so, why was not the American producer of goatskins, sheepskins, calfskins, pigskins, horsehides, and every other kind of skins taken under the mantle of protection that was thrown around the producer of cattle hides? Perhaps the production of hides of cattle was thought to be an infant industry or one that was struggling to get along and needed the fostering care of a high tariff rate. Let us examine that proposition for a moment. Taking the period of 1893 to 1900, both inclusive, we find upon examination of the official report of the secretary of the Union Stock Yard at Chicago that native steers brought the highest price during those eight years, in December, 1899, when they sold for \$7.40 per hundredweight on the hoof, and during that same month green salted hides sold at 14 cents per pound, the top-notch price for that eight-year period. Assuming the average weight of a steer to be 1,500 pounds, the animal was then worth \$111. Assuming its hide to weigh 100 pounds, that was worth \$14, or a trifle less than one-eighth of the market price of the steer.

Take another instance: In June, 1894, when steers, live weight, brought but \$5 per hundred pounds and hides 5½ cents per pound. At these figures a 1,500-pound steer was worth \$75 and his hide \$5.25, or less than one-fiftieth of the entire value of the animal.

These figures not only refute any contention that the production of cattle hides is an industry which needs and should have protection, but they prove most clearly and convincingly that hides of cattle are a by-product of the beef business, and being a by-product are not entitled to any measure of protection whatever. It is no part or parcel of the true policy of protection to protect the by-products of an established industry, especially when that industry is already amply protected from foreign competition. Then why enhance the price by a tariff, and thus tax our people on an article the production of which is not an industry but must always remain a mere side issue, and incident of a vast business that is already so heavily protected it can sell its wares to aliens across the sea cheaper than to our own people?

When the Dingley bill was being framed it was vigorously contended that the proposed tariff on hides was in the interest of and would benefit the farmer and stock raiser, and upon that theory, and that alone, the tax was imposed. If that contention had been true when it was made, or had it proven to be true under the operations of the bill, there would be some foundation for the retention of the tariff.

That it was thought to be true when the bill was under discussion I shall not dispute, but I most emphatically deny that the farmer or stockman, except in two contingencies, to which I shall refer, receives one iota of benefit from this tariff.

Cattle are not raised in this country for their hides. Every schoolboy knows that. They never have been, and never will be, raised for that purpose, but must always be raised solely because of their value as a food product. A tariff which might add \$1.50 or \$2 to the value of a hide, which is but a fifteenth of the market price of the animal, is no more incentive to the production of hides than is the rising and setting of the sun. To increase the output of hides it would be necessary to impose a tariff high enough to make the hide the principal element of value and the meat a by-product. Then, and then only, would the hide industry be stimulated and cattle be raised for their hides.

The farmer and the stockman sell their beeves at live weight, or "on the hoof," as it is termed in the trade. If the hide was an element in determining the price to be paid for beef animals, there would be some relation between the market prices of steers on the hoof and hides. When the price of steers went up the price of hides would advance also, and in proportion as is the weight of the hide to that of the live animal. When the price of steers went down the price of hides would take a relative drop. But examination of the quotations before referred to, which are tabulated by months and which I shall incorporate in my remarks without reading in detail, discloses the contrary to be the case.

Date.	Native steers per 100 pounds.	Native steer hides per pound.	Date.	Native steers per 100 pounds.	Native steer hides per pound.
1893.		Cents.	1900.		Cents.
January.....	\$6.00	9	January.....	7.25	13½
February.....	6.15	9	February.....	6.50	12½
March.....	6.15	8½	March.....	6.10	12½
April.....	6.00	8	April.....	6.05	12½
May.....	6.25	7½	May.....	5.85	12½
June.....	6.00	6½	June.....	5.85	11½
July.....	5.6½	6½	July.....	6.00	10½
August.....	5.7½	6½	August.....	6.05	11½
September.....	5.70	6½	September.....	6.20	11½
October.....	5.90	7½	October.....	6.00	11½
November.....	6.35	7½	November.....	6.00	13
December.....	6.75	7	December.....	6.25	12½
Average.....	6.02	7.53	Average.....	6.17	12.18
1894.					
January.....	\$5.65	6½			
February.....	5.20	6½			
March.....	5.00	6			
April.....	4.90	5½			
May.....	4.75	5½			
June.....	5.00	5½			
July.....	5.05	6			
August.....	5.85	6½			
September.....	6.45	7½			
October.....	6.30	7½			
November.....	6.45	7½			
December.....	6.63	8			
Average.....	5.60	6.56			
1895.					
January.....	5.45	7½			
February.....	5.80	7½			
March.....	6.40	8½			
April.....	6.30	9½			
May.....	6.15	12½			
June.....	6.00	13			
July.....	5.85	13½			
August.....	5.85	12			
September.....	6.00	12			
October.....	5.50	11½			
November.....	4.90	9			
December.....	5.50	8½			
Average.....	5.81	10.42			
1896.					
January.....	4.90	8½			
February.....	4.70	8½			
March.....	4.70	8½			
April.....	4.75	6½			
May.....	4.50	8½			
June.....	4.55	8½			
July.....	4.60	9			
August.....	4.90	7½			
September.....	5.20	8½			
October.....	5.30	10½			
November.....	5.45	10½			
December.....	6.25	9½			
Average.....	5.00	8.75			
1897.					
January.....	5.50	9½			
February.....	5.40	9½			
March.....	5.65	9½			
April.....	5.40	9½			
May.....	5.40	9½			
June.....	5.90	10			
July.....	5.15	10½			
August.....	5.50	10½			
September.....	5.75	11½			
October.....	5.30	11½			
November.....	5.00	11½			
December.....	5.65	11			
Average.....	5.48	10.20			
1898.					
January.....	5.45	11½			
February.....	5.00	11½			
March.....	5.70	11			
April.....	5.50	11½			
May.....	5.25	12½			
June.....	5.50	13			
July.....	5.65	12½			
August.....	5.75	12			
September.....	5.85	12			
October.....	5.90	11½			
November.....	5.80	11½			
December.....	5.95	11½			
Average.....	5.66	11.80			
1899.					
January.....	3.30	11½			
February.....	6.25	11½			
March.....	5.90	11½			
April.....	5.80	12			
May.....	5.65	12½			
June.....	5.75	12½			
July.....	6.00	12½			
August.....	6.45	12½			
September.....	6.90	13			
October.....	6.95	13½			
November.....	7.00	14			
December.....	7.40	14			
Average.....	6.36	12.60			

During the eight years covered by this table there is hardly an exception to the rule that hides were falling when steers on the hoof were advancing, and when the market price of steers was falling the price of hides was advancing, proving conclusively that the hide was not a factor in fixing the price of the animal. And if the hide does not increase the price of the steer, it is absolutely certain the tariff on the hide does not benefit the man who sells the steer, but does inure to the benefit of the man who sells the hide after it is taken from the steer, and to him alone.

The farmer who loses a beeve by sickness or who slaughters one for food can sell the skin for a price 15 per cent more than he could get if there was no tariff on hides. The stockman losing a few steers by blizzards or other causes, if he can find and skin the bodies, gets the benefit of the tariff on hides, and these, I reiterate, are the only instances where the farmer or stockman receives any benefit, direct or indirect, from that tariff. If anyone believes the hide on a steer influences the market price of the animal, let him ponder on these figures. The prices I quote are for steers live weight per hundred pounds and for hides per single pound.

Date.	Steers per 100 pounds.	Hides per pound.
1893.		Cents.
January.....	\$6.00	9
April.....	6.00	8
June.....	6.00	6½
1895.		
June.....	6.00	13
September.....	6.00	12
1899.		
July.....	6.00	12½
1900.		
July.....	6.00	10½
October.....	6.00	11½
November.....	6.00	13

Here are nine instances—five before the Dingley tariff law with hides on the free list, and four subsequent to the passage of that law, which taxed hides 15 per cent ad valorem—when steers in each case were \$6 per 100 pounds on the hoof, and the price of hides ranged from 6½ to 13 cents per pound.

Once before the Dingley law, in June, 1895, and once after it, in November, 1900, with steers at \$6, the price of hides was the same, to wit, 13 cents per pound. Let us select a few cases where the price of hides was the same and see what relation that bore to the price of live steers.

Date.	Hides per pound.	Live steers per 100 pounds.
1895.	Cents.	
May.....	12½	\$6.15
1898.		
July.....	12½	5.65
1899.		
May.....	12½	5.65
July.....	12½	6.00
August.....	12½	6.45
1900.		
March.....	12½	6.10

Here are six instances, one before and five since the Dingley bill, when hides were 12½ cents per pound, and in only two cases—July, 1898, and May, 1899, both under the operations of that law—was the price of steers the same.

In the light of these facts, will anyone seriously contend that the hide is any appreciable factor in fixing the price the farmer or cattle raiser will get for his beeves? And having these tables

in mind, who can be deceived further by the contention that the tariff on hides benefits the farmer or the stockman of the West?

If the inutility of this tariff as a revenue producer or as a protection to American farmers were all that could be alleged against it, these reasons alone would warrant its immediate repeal. Unfortunately for the country these are but minor and trivial evils compared with the great wrong and injustice that is being perpetrated upon the people by this tariff on hides. Two great industries—leather and boots and shoes—and every man, woman, and child in the United States wearing shoes are directly affected by it, and its burden fall heaviest upon those the least able to bear it, as I shall later demonstrate. That the committee may realize the magnitude of the financial interests and the number of working people affected, I beg to submit a few statistics obtained from a preliminary report of the Twelfth Census:

	Boots and shoes, factory product, 1900.	Leather, tanned, curried, and finished.	Total leather and boots and shoes.
Number of establishments	1,600	1,306	2,906
Capital	\$101,735,233	\$173,977,421	\$275,712,654
Wage-earners, average number	142,922	52,109	195,031
Miscellaneous expenses	\$10,766,402	\$7,023,416	\$17,789,818
Total expenses	\$59,175,853	\$22,591,091	\$81,766,944
Amount paid for contract work	\$1,751,448	—	—
Cost of materials used	\$169,004,034	\$155,003,004	\$323,207,038
Total value of products	\$291,028,580	\$204,068,127	\$495,096,707
Boots and shoes for men, youths, and boys:			
Number of pairs	89,123,318	—	—
Value	\$129,505,235	—	—
Boots and shoes for women, misses, and children:			
Number of pairs	107,415,855	—	—
Value	\$112,823,914	—	—
Slippers for men, youths, and boys:			
Number of pairs	4,453,905	—	—
Value	\$2,812,213	—	—
Slippers, oxfords, and low cuts for women, misses, and children:			
Number of pairs	12,655,876	—	—
Value	\$10,143,393	—	—
All other products	\$5,740,825	—	—

These statistics relate only to the production of tanned, curried, and finished leather and the factory product of boots and shoes, and do not include belting and hose leather, leather goods, trunks, valises, pocketbooks, saddlery, harnesses, gloves, and mittens, or cut stock, uppers, and custom work, and boot and shoe findings in the latter industry. In the single State of Massachusetts, where I have been able to get the figures, these items of themselves represent 929 establishments with \$11,173,082 of capital, giving employment to 9,312 persons, paying annual wages amounting to \$3,881,916 and producing goods valued at \$31,242,391. These figures, I repeat, relate only to side issues of the leather and boot and shoe industries in a single State.

To keep the thousands of establishments, with their hundreds of thousands of operatives, employed we must have hides, and the domestic supply is wholly inadequate to meet the demands, either as to quantity or quality. The domestic green-salted hide can not, in many instances, take the place of the foreign dry hide, even were the annual output sufficient for that purpose; and the leather men are forced in consequence to import enormous quantities of the latter—in some years as high as 163,000,000 pounds. The duty on hides not only increases the cost of these hides by 15 per cent, but it also adds that same percentage of cost to every domestic hide. One of three things must naturally follow: Either the profits of the manufacturer are reduced, the wage-earning power of the employee curtailed, or the cost of the manufactured product is enhanced to the consumer.

So far as the boot and shoe industry is concerned I am convinced all three of these results have followed, and with the exception of the tanners and their employees I think the same is true of the leather industry. From the statistics before quoted it will be seen that our factories turn out annually 213,653,014 pairs of boots, shoes, and slippers. One might think it would keep the 1,600 establishments engaged in this business pretty busy during the twelve months. Such is not the case, however. This entire output, vast as it is, can be turned out, according to the estimate of experts, in from six to eight months, if the factories were to run full time. With this four or six months of enforced idleness for plant and operative fully employed, it is axiomatic that the employer would make greater profit and the employee receive more wages.

Can this be done? I answer, emphatically, yes. Remove the tariff handicap now restraining our shoe manufacturers in the race for the world's markets and they will soon gain enough foreign trade to keep their factories busy the year round. This will largely increase the wages of the shoe operatives, giving them

more money to spend, and so making them larger consumers of the products of other industries, while at the same time it will give a direct and perceptible benefit to the farmer and stock raiser in creating a greater demand and therefore a more steady market for the hides he produces.

A moment ago I spoke of the tariff on hides being a handicap on the shoe manufacturer when seeking foreign markets. It is a handicap and a serious one in a business where the net profit is figured in pennies per pair as it is in the boot and shoe industry. The Dingley bill provides a rebate of the tariff if the imported hide after being tanned is subsequently exported. That is a good thing for the tanners, as it gives American labor the benefit of the wages for tanning, but a repeal of the tariff would in no wise affect the tanners. Just as many hides would be tanned under free entry as under a duty.

The tariff is disastrous, however, to the shoe man who seeks to export his product, for it increases the cost 15 per cent of all leather made from cattle hides which enters into the make-up of his goods. It is disastrous in another way. The tanner of foreign hides in this country, by virtue of the drawback clause, can sell leather to the foreign shoe manufacturer at from 10 to 12 per cent less, according to the amount of freight charges he must pay, than he can to the American, who must compete with that foreign manufacturer in the world's markets. In 1900 we exported boots and shoes to the value of \$4,274,174—a mere drop, however, in the total output of our factories, and an infinitesimally small per cent of their capacity. This has been done by American perseverance, pluck, and enterprise despite the higher cost of materials to our manufacturers.

Give us somewhere near an equal show with the foreigner in the cost of leather and the superior skill of American labor will soon place in all the markets of Europe a shoe that can not be surpassed in the world for beauty, finish, and durability.

Some one may say, "Does not the drawback apply to the imported leather that goes into the exported shoe?" Oh, yes; but all exported shoes are not made from imported leather. They may be, and doubtless are, made partly from imported and partly from domestic leather. As there are from 15 to 25 parts or pieces in a shoe, it is absolutely impossible in practice to keep track of the leather from which the shoe is made, for the purpose of getting the drawback on that which was imported. So the drawback feature is of no benefit to the manufacturer, but must always remain a detriment, as long as the duty remains on hides, inasmuch as it is in practical effect that much protection to the foreign manufacturer. Not only is this true of the boot and shoe industry, but also of the belting, trunk, saddle, and harness men who are seeking a foreign outlet for their wares.

Whoever thought the Dingley tariff law would ever operate to protect a foreign manufacturer against the competition of his American rival? Let the champions of the "let-well-enough-alone" policy on this floor ponder on that feature of their sacred ultra high-tariff schedules, and see if their better judgment does not tell them the time is now at hand when the hide schedule should be revised in the interest of American manufacturers and American wage earners and no longer kept on the statute books to protect our foreign rivals.

There is another feature of this tariff on hides not yet touched upon—that is, its effect upon the American consumer, the general public, who buy the two hundred and odd millions of pairs of shoes we make each year. I stated some time ago this tariff bore the heaviest on those the least able to stand it.

Careful and conservative estimates of the added cost by reason of the tariff have been made, and these show the increased cost, solely because of the tariff, to be from 2 cents per pair on women's and men's high-grade shoes, up to 12 and 15 cents per pair on the coarsest, heaviest grades worn by workmen and farmers, the cost increasing in the proportion of heavy leather in the boot or shoe. If the operation of a tariff schedule makes any discrimination in the burden it imposes, it should be in favor of those who have the least means rather than in favor of the rich. Yet here is a case where the rich man, who can buy shoes of the finest grade, having in them the minimum of duty-affected leather, pays less duty increase per pair, although he may pay five or ten or fifteen times more for the shoes, than does the man whose necessities and purse compel him to purchase the coarser grades.

A gentleman's shoe costing, say, \$5 or \$10 will have in it leather which has been increased in price by the tariff probably about 4 or 5 cents. The purchaser of that shoe contributes to "the big six," familiarly known as the beef trust, for that is the sponge which is absorbing this 15 per cent tariff, and not the stock raiser or farmer, about 1 cent on each dollar expended.

I have been told by one claiming to know that the heavy, coarse shoes worn by workmen in the rolling mills at Pittsburgh sold for \$1 per pair before the Dingley bill. They are made entirely of leather affected by the tariff, and now sell for \$1.15 per pair. The iron worker contributes to the trust almost 15 cents on each

dollar invested in shoes, and recently the trust, thinking it was not being fairly treated by the public, has shoved up the price of beef, and is now wringing from rich and poor alike some 2 to 5 cents additional on each pound of beef it sells. How long, think you, "Mr. Let-well-enough-alone," will the American people stand a tariff schedule operating in this manner and enriching no one but the beef trust? Is it not better to remedy that injustice now rather than to wait until they are so thoroughly exasperated they will rise in their might and sweep the whole protective fabric out of existence?

I have said heretofore the farmer gets no benefit from this tariff on hides; but admitting for argument the whole 15 per cent goes directly into his pocket and gives him that much more for every beeve he sells, is he as well off under the tariff as he would be under free entry of hides? If every farmer in the United States sells annually one beef animal, for which he gets the full benefit of the tariff on hides, he will have about \$1.50 to carry to the credit side of his ledger. Then let him figure out and carry to the debit side the added cost of the boots he buys for himself, his wife, and children, the harness and saddles he must purchase, and all other manufactures of leather he uses, and it will not take him very long to see that his account does not balance. There is altogether too much on the debit side, and he finds that every dollar of protection he is getting on hides is costing him not less than \$3 to obtain.

In this connection I wish to read an extract from a letter sent to a member of this body by a constituent:

The farmers of Minnesota average to kill one beef "critter" annually. The duty of 15 per cent adds to the value of the hide at present market price about 60 cents. The farmer, on an average, consumes annually about \$70 worth of shoes and harness, at an increased cost of about 8 per cent, or \$5.60. So you can see how much benefit he receives when he has to pay \$5.60 to make 60 cents. The tanner, shoe manufacturer, and harness maker require more capital to run their business, so they don't want it. The farmer don't want it, the laborer don't want it, you don't want it; nobody but the packer wants it, so let's repeal and no longer handicap one of the great industries of the country.

This sort of protection, if applied to all the needs of the farmer, would soon land him in the poorhouse. When he realizes how the hide tariff is working and finds that his share of profits under it is purely theoretical, that he is getting the shadow and not the substance, and he is beginning to realize it, how much longer will he submit to the exactions of the beef trust?

Mr. Chairman, in whatever aspect this tariff on hides may be viewed, it is a delusion, a snare, and a fraud upon the American people. I say this not as a free trader or tariff reformer, but as a protectionist who wants to see the true policy of protection upheld and sustained to the end, that it may continue to be the mainspring of our national progress and prosperity. Such perversion of a sound and wise economic policy as is shown by the imposition and continuance of this tariff on hides can but serve to shatter the faith of the people in protection and bring the whole structure down in ruins about our heads.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I send to the desk and ask to have read a letter written twelve years ago.

The Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, April 10, 1890.

DEAR MR. MCKINLEY: It is a great mistake to take hides from the free list, where they have been for so many years. It is a slap in the face to the South Americans with whom we are trying to enlarge our trade. It will benefit the farmer by adding 5 to 8 per cent to the price of his children's shoes. It will yield a profit to the butcher only—the last man that needs it. The movement is injudicious from beginning to end, in every form and phase. Pray stop it before it sees light. Such movements as this for protection will protect the Republican party into a speedy retirement.

Yours, hastily,

JAMES G. BLAINE.

HON. WILLIAM MCKINLEY,
Chairman Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROBERTS. No better or more concise epitome of the argument against a tariff on hides has ever been made. Every word and every line of it are as true to-day as when penned. I believe that letter prevented the placing of a duty on hides in the McKinley bill. William McKinley had the wisdom to see the injustice of such a tariff and the moral strength to resist the enormous pressure for its imposition. Let us profit by his wisdom, the profoundness of which has been amply demonstrated by the experience of the last five years, and, emulating his moral courage and grandeur, strike off from the statute books this useless and unjust tariff. Let us relieve the farmers and laborers of an unnecessary burden and give to the American manufacturer of shoes and leather goods a fair field with manufacturers of other wares in the grand struggle for foreign markets which all are so gallantly making. Let us restore to the beneficent policy of protection its true meaning and just purposes. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

[Mr. BARTLETT addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] is recognized for forty minutes.

Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the only ob-

jection I have to the pending measure is that the proposed reduction on Cuban sugar is entirely inadequate, but, if it is all that can be obtained, it is still in keeping with the Democratic policy of tariff revision, no matter from what source this particular bill may come, or who may approve or oppose it.

As a special measure of relief to Cuba it should be passed, though it is at most but a partial fulfillment of the great moral obligation which we have assumed toward the people of that island. When amendments shall be proposed granting still further concessions they shall receive my support, and I should be willing to go to the limit of reduction, not only on Cuban sugar, but the raw and refined sugar of the world, and thereby lower the price of this necessary of life to the great body of American consumers who ask no protective legislation, but only the right to buy at the same competitive prices at which they are compelled to sell the products of their toil.

If I believed in protection for its own sake, and regarded a tariff schedule as a sacred thing not to be profaned by the unholy hand of revision, as many of our Republican friends profess to believe, I would stand with the beet-sugar industries of the Northwest and oppose this measure. But denying, as I do, the theory and practice of protection, believing its present manifestation to be a menace to healthy trade, and that it has fostered the most unjust and iniquitous system of industrial trusts ever devised by the cupidity of man, I shall stand with the great majority of my fellow-Democrats who believe that they see in the divisions of the other side of the Chamber the first apparent sign that the heavy load of unfair taxation will be lifted from the straining back of the patient consumer. The spectacle of the stall-fed sugar trust and the infant beet industry, whose lungs and capacity to kick at least are well developed, both offshoots of protection, calling each other hard names and filling the atmosphere with direful threats of retaliation, if not dignified, is at least a matter of congratulation to those who would escape from the hard conditions imposed by the protective-tariff system; for out of this confusion and division the man on the farm and the great mass of unprotected Americans may find a way to buy more cheaply, and lessen the present high cost of comfortable living.

As a Democrat, I believe that neither cane sugar nor beet sugar should have any more protection than cotton, or corn, or any other product of the farm and that every particle of protection should be taken off the necessities of life.

I hope the American people will see in the scenes enacted on this floor a justification as well as a good reason for returning to the true principles of taxation, not to be used as a means of enriching the few at the expense of the many or of fleecing from the people, under the old and stale pretense of encouraging infant industries, but as the most important function of government to be wisely, honestly, and fairly administered for the benefit of all and for the exclusive use of none.

The whole system of protection was wrong from the beginning. As a policy of Government it has rarely if ever found favor with any student of economics, but has been almost universally condemned, and has only been tolerated by the patience of the people and sustained by the greed of its favorites. It has always operated to increase the cost of living to the masses and to put that increase into the pockets of the classes. If ever tolerable, it was in the earlier days when the rates of duty were not half so high as at present and when it seemed necessary to stimulate manufacturing industries in a country almost wholly agricultural.

These industries would have grown without protection, and probably in a healthier and more uniform way, and the wealth of the country have been more evenly distributed; but the farmer who has sold in the open market of the world has been forced to buy in protected markets, and the result has been that no matter how rich or productive his land or how arduous or intelligent his labor, he can make no more than a competency at best, and must forego the luxuries and too often the conveniences and necessities of modern life. So we have from decade to decade and year to year seen the wealth of the country absorbed to an abnormal degree by the manufacturing classes.

The second step in the industrial evolution came when combinations and alliances were formed to prevent prices from falling to their natural level and to reap the full advantage of tariff duties imposed for their assumed protection.

The third and most intolerable condition of all came when allied wealth in the form of trusts demanded and received still greater protection, and then, holding the home consumer at their mercy, began to export and sell their manufactured products to foreigners at less cost than to Americans.

This odious condition of affairs has been made possible by the system of misnamed protection, which fleeces the home consumer who pays the tariff duties and gives to the alien a benefit denied to our own people. A system so constructed as to demand and receive the highest price at home and the lowest price

abroad for its manufactured products is one which can neither be approved in fair business dealings nor in sound morals.

The first time that the attention of the public was called to the enormity of this evil was in 1890, when the tariff reform committee of the Reform Club published a pamphlet entitled "Protection's Home Market." In this pamphlet we find quoted the domestic and export prices of numerous agricultural implements and tools, of kitchen utensils and household goods, carpenters' tools, hardware, etc. The domestic prices usually exceeded the foreign prices from 10 to 25 per cent, but the difference reached 100 per cent in some cases. A few of the articles and prices are found in the following table:

Articles.	Domestic price.	Foreign price.
Cultivators.....	\$11.00	\$8.40
Plows.....	14.00	12.60
Axes.....	8.25	7.20
Kettles.....per dozen..	1.40	.85
Wire nails.....per 100 pounds..	2.25	1.35
Table knives.....per gross..	15.00	12.00
Horse nails.....per pound..	.17	.14
Barbed wire.....per 100 pounds..	3.00	2.00
Rivets.....do..	10.00	5.55
Typewriters.....	100.00	60.00
Sewing machines:		
Fine.....	27.50	20.75
Medium.....	22.00	17.50
Cheap.....	18.00	12.00

In some cases our sewing machines have been sold as low as \$5 in the South American market.

There are many quotations available from Republican sources, admitting, explaining, or attempting to justify the custom of charging lower prices for export. Thus the New York Press of October 22, 1889, said:

It is sometimes looked upon as wise to ship goods out of the country at cost, rather than break the regular price for which such articles sell in the country in which they are produced.

The American Machinist of September 26, 1889, said:

Just why American manufacturers will sell machinery and other goods from 10 to 30 per cent cheaper in Europe than they will sell them to be used at home is rather puzzling; but anyone curious in the matter can easily enough find out that many of them do that. It may be necessary to cut prices in order to secure trade from abroad, but it is likely to strike the American purchaser as being a little rough on him.

The Engineering and Mining Journal of March 15, 1890, complained of the system, as follows:

As soon as an industry has obtained a position where it can more than supply our home market and has to send its goods abroad, where they compete with those of foreign manufacturers, it is evident that they are either giving the foreigners the benefit of lower rates than they do our own people or that they are able to get along at home without any protection from foreign manufacturers. It is not fair that our own people should be made to pay more than foreigners for the products of our own land.

A letter from Mr. A. B. Farquhar, the head of the great Pennsylvania Agricultural Works, to the Farmer's Call, of Quincy, Ill., may be quoted here. In answer to the Call's questions, Mr. Farquhar said:

JULY 30, 1890.

The fact is that our protective laws are a monstrous swindle upon the agricultural community. As a manufacturer I was inclined to say nothing on the subject, for the reason that it was natural to suppose if anybody was benefited it was the manufacturing class, to which I belong. But, as I have explained, the farmer is being destroyed. We are killing the goose for the golden egg. And I honestly believe now that it is to the interest of the manufacturers themselves to eliminate the protective feature from our tariff laws.

Certainly, as our manufacturers are sold much lower abroad, we could only need protection to get better prices from our customers at home. We do manufacture and sell in Canada, South America, and Europe many agricultural implements and machines, and could we have free raw material and the commercial advantages which free trade would give us, America would become the great manufacturing emporium of the world, and the farmer, of course, would share the prosperity, since he would have less to pay for everything and get better prices for all he sold. Go on with your good work. When the farmer begins to think and rise up against this swindle it is doomed.

In answer to a claim made by the Australasian and South American (an export journal), that the lower prices quoted for foreigners were for the wholesale trade only, the New York World published the following letter from the Engineering and Mining Journal of New York:

ENGINEERING AND MINING JOURNAL,
New York, August 26, 1890.

DEAR SIR: I am obliged to you for the letter of August 25, respecting proceedings taken in the Senate regarding our "prices current."

Prices quoted by us are, as you will notice, at the head of the first column, "for export only," and the prices therein given are the prices at which every foreign subscriber can buy in this market. It stands to reason that orders for farm implements are frequently given for one only. If to buy one machine is retail trade, then these foreign prices are retail prices.

Our domestic subscribers are debarré from the prices quoted in these columns. These special discounts are "for export only," and in more than one instance we have lost our advertiser through publishing these prices.

I inclose an invoice from S. Allen & Co., which you will see is for one of the machines quoted by us, and you will notice that it conforms exactly with our prices as reprinted by you in the World, and that the net price on the bill is exactly as stated by you in the World.

Your statement that the foreigner can buy at retail in this market cheaper than the domestic consumer is as indisputable as the daily revolution of the earth. We can enumerate any number of instances where houses have written us: "Prices furnished are for export only, and it would be most injurious to us if these figures were circulated in the home market."

In going through our letters this morning we counted no less than fifty-eight received during the month of July, thanking us for publishing the "prices current," as it enabled our subscribers to keep a check on the prices charged them on their indents.

Yours, very truly,

ENGINEERING AND MINING JOURNAL.

After examining the facts, Mr. J. Alex. Lindquist, the author of the tariff-reform pamphlet, concludes—

that our manufacturers take advantage of our tariff to keep the price of their goods in our home market not merely much higher than they could do if there were no tariff, but much higher than they themselves would be able and willing to produce and sell the same goods for if they were not protected at all.

And asks the following pertinent question:

Why should our manufacturers be aided by our laws to charge our citizens more for the same goods than they do foreigners?

We find in a Government publication called the "Bureau of Statistics," under undoubted Republican auspices, a large number of valuable statements and confessions. We are informed, for instance, that "the progress of work on shipbuilding in the United States has been retarded because makers of steel materials require a higher price from the American consumers than from the foreign consumers for substantially similar products." Also, in addition to this, that "American export plate makers are interested in preventing the establishment of plate manufacturing in their customer nations abroad, and to that end bid low enough in foreign markets to discourage foreign nations from entering the field for producing their own plate at home." The same authority contends that this policy is "short-sighted," and shows how it has resulted in curtailing the home demand. Up to April, 1900, it "had resulted in a very positive shrinkage in domestic consumption. Farmers had ceased to purchase barbed wire for wire fences. Retail hardware dealers had complained for months of diminished business in nails and wires. Jobbers had gotten in the way of doing a hand to mouth business on prices that had advanced from \$1.35 to \$3.20 in the course of a year." The writer goes on to say:

If steel rails, for example, sell at Pittsburgh for \$35 per ton for months in succession for home consumption, while the foreign consumer is purchasing them for \$22 to \$24 per ton, the domestic market is sure to order no more than it is obliged to have for the time being. In the long run such a policy is short-sighted, because it puts an embargo on the expansion of investments in enterprises requiring iron and steel. It arrests constructive projects at home, while it stimulates construction abroad.

Those of our manufacturing interests that are outside of the trusts desire most earnestly that this condition of affairs should not continue. A good illustration of the way in which they regard the matter is afforded by a recent letter to the editor of the Iron Age, of New York, from Mr. F. A. Wilmot, president of the Wilmot & Hobbs Manufacturing Company, of Bridgeport, Conn., a portion of which reads as follows:

We would suggest that you give due prominence to the position which the manufacturing associations in the various cities, particularly along the Atlantic seaboard and Canadian border, and especially in New England, are taking as regards their present handicap in the cost of raw material, such as coal, coke, iron ore, pig iron, steel ingots, and billets, and their desire to have these commodities placed by Congress immediately on the free list. They believe that as these materials are produced cheaper in this country than in any other portion of the world and are sold abroad at lower prices than along the seaboard and Canadian border, the industries which produce them are no longer infant and do not need protection. They believe that protection, so called, is but another term for Government assistance to monopolies and trusts. This position the Government, as it now exists, can ill afford to assume, nor can it allow the people to feel that it is drifting into such a position where it is so working hand in hand with gigantic trusts, for when the people realize such to be the condition they will undoubtedly rise in their might and by their votes change the conditions and the Government which permits such conditions. * * * It is to be hoped that the Government of the United States will appreciate the position and make such changes in tariff regulations or duties from time to time as will result in putting upon the free list such commodities as do not further need protection on the score of their being infant industries.

This letter and other similar testimony does not indicate that the smaller manufacturers would be injured by a reduction of tariff duties.

In May, 1901, less than a year ago, Mr. Charles M. Schwab, the president of the steel trust, testifying before the Industrial Commission, startled the country by declaring that all kinds of American goods were usually sold much lower for export than in the home market. In fact, he said that the prices of everything for export were less than for domestic use and consumption, and that supplies and materials to be used in products for export were usually furnished to manufacturers at special prices, while goods to be exported were carried by the railroads at reduced rates. Here are some extracts from Mr. Schwab's testimony:

It is quite true that export prices are made at a very much lower rate than those here. * * * I think you can safely say this, that where large export business is done—for example, in the line of iron and steel—nearly all the people from whom supplies are bought for that purpose give you a good price for the materials that go into export; railroads will, in most instances, carry them a little cheaper for you, and so on all down the line. But labor, within

my knowledge at least, has never been asked to work for a lower price for export material, so that labor benefits more by it than almost any other interest. * * *

Q. Is it a fact generally true of all exporters in this country that they do sell at lower prices in foreign markets than they do in the home market?

A. That is true; perfectly true. * * *

Mr. Byron W. Holt, of the tariff-reform committee of the New York Reform Club, also testified at length on the subject of tariffs and trusts before the Industrial Commission. The following are extracts from Mr. Holt's testimony in regard to export prices:

The concealment of export prices is probably responsible for considerable of the difference between the values of our exports and of our imports, and, therefore, for numerous editorials on our "favorable balance of trade."

Ten years ago it was comparatively easy to get the export prices of various protected articles, even though they were then often from 10 to 30 per cent below the home market prices. To-day, when great trusts control the prices on most of our exports, it is extremely difficult to obtain export prices. The editors of trade papers will no longer talk on this subject, and, as a rule, will not keep on file foreign exchanges which quote prices of certain American goods in foreign countries. It is only now and then that an employee of a trust or of some export house can be found who is willing to risk betrayal and almost certain decapitation if he talks on this subject.

Nearly all of the information on this point which I have obtained during the last few years has been strictly confidential. In this way I learned a few days ago that tin plate is being extensively offered and in some instances has been sold to manufacturers of cans and packages, to be filled with products for export, at about \$1 per box below the price to other manufacturers and consumers. I am not permitted to mention any names. I also learned last week from an entirely reliable source that steel rails were sold some three months ago to foreigners at less than \$21 per ton. I could specify the exact price, names of both seller and buyer, in an important recent transaction, but am not permitted to do so. These rails were sold with the provision that they were not to be used in the United States. That steel rails are sold for export at whatever the manufacturer can get above \$20, and perhaps for considerably less if the time of delivery is remote enough, I do not doubt. The manufacturers' pool or selling agreement, under which rails are now sold for \$28, is not effective on rails sold to foreigners or for export. The newspapers of a month or so ago contained the details of a sale of steel rails to an English firm for \$15 per ton (allowing for freight) less than the price to Americans. The New York World of April 9, 1901, thus states the case:

"Mr. Charles Thulin, a Pennsylvania contractor, recently secured a contract to supply rails for Russia's great Siberian railway. He asked the leading steel trust companies here for bids. They all asked him about \$35 per ton, with freight to be added. Mr. Thulin went over to England, sublet his contract to an English firm, and one of the same companies that had asked him \$35, plus freight here, sold the rails at \$24 a ton delivered in England to the English subcontractor." * * *

After having investigated this subject for more than ten years, I have reached the conclusion that practically all of our manufactured products are sold to foreigners for less than to Americans. The minimum difference is about 10 per cent. The average difference in price is probably 20 per cent, and on our really protected products above 25 per cent. Often we who pay the tariff taxes devoted to nourishing these "infant industries" must pay 50 per cent and sometimes 100 per cent more for the products of the coddled industries than is paid by foreigners who do not pay our nursing taxes.

The record in regard to the prices, foreign and domestic, of wire and wire rope is instructive and illustrative of the rapacity of the trust and the fraud practiced on the American consumer. The trust controlling these articles have put prices at home up to the tariff limit, while lowering prices to foreigners, so that our wire rope is exported to every foreign country, with the possible exception of England. As the duty on imported wire rope averages about 100 per cent, the trust charges domestic consumers about twice as much as it charges foreigners for its goods—often more than twice as much. For example, the domestic price of wire rope is about \$5, \$6, and \$7.50 per 100 pounds, according to the different sizes, but the export prices for these sizes, respectively, are \$2.34, \$3.23, and \$3.88. The prices of wire vary also according to the size. For the largest size the domestic price is about \$4.25 per 100 pounds, and the export price about \$2.62, or about 65 per cent in favor of the foreigner.

Our oil machinery manufactured in this country follows the same rule as our agricultural machinery. The farmers of Mexico, South America, and Canada can obtain our agricultural implements for half the money that our own farmers have to pay for them, and our oil machinery is sold at a lower figure to the Russians than to our own oil producers in Texas.

This favoritism to foreigners has been extended more or less to those nondescript peoples, half foreign and half domestic, who inhabit our colonial possessions, such as Hawaii and Porto Rico. Some of our manufacturers treat these peoples as foreigners and sell them our goods at reduced rates, and some treat them as people of our own country, and charge them accordingly.

An instance is cited where goods had been sold in Honolulu at such low prices that great quantities of them were brought back to California and sold there at profit in competition with similar goods in the domestic market which have never been out of the country. One of the aggrieved manufacturers registered his complaint in a letter to the Iron Age a few months ago, in which he said:

It so happens that at present the price of our goods is about 25 per cent higher for domestic consumption than the export prices. We had an inquiry for export prices, which we quoted. The order now comes in to be shipped to Honolulu. Is it fair to consider the Hawaiian Islands entitled to export prices? Our own opinion is that they have become a part of the United States and should be considered domestic territory as much as Alaska.

Many other instances might be cited and much more proof adduced to show the selfish and nefarious practices of the trusts,

sustained, as they are, and fostered by the Republican party. Who doubts their absolute power in this Congress to prevent a change in a single tariff schedule, no matter how unjust or unnecessary it may be?

When the Republican party and a Republican President announce their opposition to the trusts, as a proof of sincerity we ask for a recommendation from the Executive that all or some of the articles selling abroad cheaper than at home be forthwith put upon the free list and that a bill be reported from the Ways and Means Committee to this effect. And when this Congress shall have adjourned, and not one of these articles shall have been put upon the free list, and not one tariff schedule reduced, then the American people will understand and rightly value these specious pretensions.

Mr. Chairman, the question of taxation is vital and comes directly home to all the people. It affects us all, but most of all the American farmer. I represent, in part, an agricultural constituency, as well as a city of large and growing commercial importance, but whose prosperity, in a great measure, depends upon the crops produced in the magnificent country which surrounds it. Her merchants and her laboring men are realizing more than ever the crushing power of the modern industrial trust.

The farmer who in the early spring goes out, turns up the soil, and plants the seed which he hopes will grow and burst into rich fruitage in the fall must depend upon seasons of sunshine and rain beyond his mortal control. A flood may come and his toil go unrequited. The drought, with its hot and fevered breath, may wither and blast the crops, and his despairing gaze may look upon parched fields of corn or the stunted growth of cotton as the unkind seasons come and go, bearing no measure of hope. If nature should smile upon his labors and the harvest should yield a rich abundance, it must then come in open competition with all other harvests wheresoever sown or reaped, and the price be fixed for his own, without his consent, in the free, open markets of the world; and then when he buys, it is in the trust-controlled market, with one-half of the proceeds of his labor exacted as a tribute.

Who says that such a farmer—and his type is to be found all over the continent—has a fair and equal chance in the great struggle? Who will deny that a partial and unjust system of taxation, which imposes these hard conditions upon his toil, weighs like a millstone upon all his endeavor, whether the seasons be good or bad?

The wife of the American farmer is compelled to use a sewing machine in her home, produced by an American factory, which costs nearly twice as much as the same machine sold the housewife of Mexico or South America. The blue rim of the mountain from which the sleeping ore is extracted may shadow the very lintels of his door; the smoke of the foundry where the crude material is fashioned into shape may float over and rest upon the furrows in his fields, yet he must pay more for the plow which came from the mountain and the factory than the Russian peasant on the banks of the Danube or the German burgher on the banks of the Rhine.

When I have gone into the homes of these farmers, brave and patient men as they are, with the best strain of patriot blood coursing through their veins, and asking nothing but a fair and equal chance in life, and behold the hard and unequal struggle, I sometimes shudder for the ending that must sooner or later come unless conditions are quickly and radically changed. And whenever they are sometimes drawn to heed political vagaries, promising immediate relief, who is to blame, they who suffer or those who make them suffer? When a trust magnate can harness his horses in golden livery and stable them in a mansion, while his wife puts diamond earrings in the ears of her pet cats, while the farmer must stint and save to buy his wife a new bonnet or his daughter a new dress, I feel that the doctrine of equal laws, equal rights and opportunities, has become an illusion, a mere matter of declamation in this Republic.

No one but a demagogue desires to make war on wealth, and none but fools will deny the difference in the capacity of men. When wealth is accumulated as the result of intelligent human endeavor, traveling the ways of equal opportunity, it stands as a distinction to its holder if it is the measure and quality of his ambition; but when it comes as a result of favoritism and the infamous system which now prevails whereby the many are robbed to enrich the few, and grows upon the ruins of honest competition, then it is an unmitigated curse, a badge of infamy, and the surest forerunner of national disaster and decay.

The danger to our Republic is from within, not without, and wealth should remember that the flood tide of prosperity will some day reach its ebb.

We all take pride in our expanding trade and the peaceful commercial invasion of the world, but it is all too dear if injustice to our people at home is the price we pay.

The manufactured products of this country have gone in sight

of the Pyramids; they are sent within the gates of the Holy City and exposed for sale along the ways which the Saviour of mankind trod in the mission of redemption; they are found in the shadow of the Chinese Wall, and we rejoice at the high enterprise and the commercial genius of the American people. But we are not without competitors and foemen worthy of battle for the markets of the world, and other nations are challenging our progress. Under the industrial system now inaugurated, we have put weapons in their hands to wrest from our grasp the fairest and richest domains of trade which our enterprise has won, while at home we are crippling our great agricultural interests, the surest defense of a nation, affording its great storehouse of supplies in national distress and peril.

The time has come in this great industrial strife when the protective tariff is a burden and not an aid. Our mastery of the world is assured when we enter the contest on equal terms and demand no undue advantage either at home or abroad. As we open our ports to competition, so the ports of other countries will open to our advance, and new and various fields will present themselves. The rare skill of the American workman, the inventive genius of the American people, and the immense impetus of a freeborn race will win in a contest of fair exchange. The world to the uttermost part is the theater of our mighty activities. "Equal and exact justice to all; special privileges to none," is the sign by which we shall conquer. [Loud applause.]

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to attempt in fifteen minutes to make a speech upon this subject. After three months of investigation, agitation, and political strife we have presented for consideration a measure entitled "A bill to provide for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba." That title might imply that the purpose of the bill was to establish reciprocity. I find, however, that it does not embrace the first principle of reciprocity.

This bill proposes a horizontal reduction of 20 per cent of our tariff on Cuban products in consideration of the adoption of the immigration, exclusion, and contract-labor laws of the United States. This is not the promulgation of the principles of reciprocity, but rather the imposition upon a republic not yet formed of laws enacted for the protection of American labor and the preservation of the character of American citizenship.

We entered into the contest with Spain upon the broad principle of humanity, and expressly declared in the declaration of war that the intervention of the United States was for the express purpose of giving to the people of Cuba their liberty and independence. We sacrificed untold wealth and thousands of precious lives in order to release the downtrodden Cubans from Spanish tyranny and extend to them the blessings of American liberty. In every act from that day to this we have reiterated our purpose to insure the establishment of a stable form of government, free and independent, and yet on the eve of the organization of its government you propose by this measure to impose upon them laws adopted by our country for the protection of American labor and the preservation of the character of American citizenship. What right have we to thus anticipate the desires, wishes, and purposes of the people of Cuba?

We are told that it is our duty to do something for Cuba, as though we had not already extended to that island and her people the greatest blessings and advantages that was ever extended by any nation to a foreign people in the history of the world.

It is admitted that under the administration of our Government during the past three years the industries of Cuba have been most prosperous; that the production of sugar has multiplied threefold; that her people are well employed at good wages; that want and distress has been removed, and in place thereof activity, industry, and prosperity established. What more can be justly asked at the hands of our people? Who demands this further concession? Not the people of Cuba, for we no longer hear the cry of distress from them. We find in the hearings before the committee no evidence of distress, want, or suffering among the people of Cuba. It is, therefore, fair to inquire who is specially interested in the adoption of this measure. Certainly not the people of Cuba or her representatives. Only last Friday I read in the Washington Post a speech made by the president of Cuba, Hon. T. Estrada Palma, before the New York Chamber of Commerce, in which he stated that the reduction proposed by this measure "will in no way afford any relief to the present distress of the Cuban producers."

Here is a man, elected by the citizens of Cuba as their president, authorized to speak for his government and people, expressly declaring that this measure will in no way afford relief to the Cuban producers. He thus declares because he realizes that every dollar of the concession proposed will be absorbed by the sugar trust, whose emissaries have been engaged night and day circulating articles of misinformation over this country to the business men, through the newspapers, and in the halls of this Capitol for the purpose of securing a reduction of the duty upon raw sugar, so as to enable it to combat with the growing sugar-

beet competitor that has been so marvelously developed in Michigan and other States under the principles of protection proclaimed and inaugurated by the Republican party.

It is admitted by everyone familiar with the subject that the proposed reduction of duty upon raw sugar from Cuba will in no way affect the price of refined sugar in this country, and consequently will be of no benefit whatever to the consumers of sugar in the United States. I represent a district composed of consumers of American products, and there is not a farmer or a sugar-beet industry within the district. If this measure would in any way benefit the consumers or reduce the price of refined sugar to them, there would be some incentive for me to make the sacrifice of Michigan's industrial interests, but the testimony before the committee conclusively establishes the fact that no reduction in the price of sugar will be made.

From the testimony I submit there is no positive evidence that the producers of sugar cane in the island of Cuba will derive any benefit whatever, but, on the contrary, our experience in Porto Rico and Hawaii justifies the assumption that the reduction will be entirely absorbed by the sugar trust.

I oppose this measure—

1. Because it seeks to impose conditions and secure concessions from a foreign people before they have had an opportunity to establish a stable form of government.

2. Because it is universally admitted that there is no distress, want of labor at good wages, or lack of industry in the island of Cuba justifying at this time any relief from the Treasury of our country or the sacrifice of our own industries.

3. Because it is an abandonment of the principles of protection and a direct injury to the infant sugar-beet industry of prodigious growth, which will, if permitted to thrive under existing laws, destroy the monopoly heretofore enjoyed by the sugar trust.

4. Because this law, if put into operation, would paralyze the further development of the sugar-beet industry in our country, and place in the hands of the sugar trust power to destroy, by purchase and competition, the advantages already secured.

During my service in Congress I have been able to follow with a great deal of pleasure the leadership, upon this side of the House, of the distinguished gentleman from New York. I have uniformly found him upon the right side of public measures and invariably opposed by the minority upon this floor. To-day I find the leader on this side joined hand in hand with the leader on the other side of the House, not only upon this floor, but in the committee, in favor of a measure embracing provisions inimical to the principles of the Republican party. When I see our leaders thus yoked together I hesitate to follow.

When I was a boy in Vermont I heard my father say that in the early days, when fireplaces were the only means of obtaining heat, they used to go into the woods and cut a log and haul it up to the house for fuel. An old farmer one day bought a new harness. The harness maker told him it was superior because made of horsehide. The next day, after breakfast, he put it on his horse and went into the woods to cut a log. While cutting the log it rained and the harness got wet. When he had prepared the log he took the horse by the bit, led him up to the house, and when he arrived there, upon looking back, somewhat to his surprise, he could see only the traces running down over the hill. He wondered where the log was. The effect of the rain had stretched the traces. It being noon, he tied his horse to the post and went in to dinner. While he was eating dinner the sun came out, and the effect upon the harness was such as to contract the traces, and as he came out from dinner he saw the old horse standing there, pulling for dear life, and coming up over the hill was the log, pulled along by the contraction of the traces. [Laughter.]

I think, Mr. Chairman, when the light of the noonday sun, in a tropical climate of midsummer, shall be turned upon this measure, the invisible traces will become known, and I fear we may find our honorable leaders yoked up to the chariot of the sugar trust. [Applause.]

I submit resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce and Convention League of Detroit and the board of directors of the Detroit River Sugar Company, protesting against this bill:

STR: At a meeting of the Detroit Chamber of Commerce and Convention League, held this 27th day of February, 1902, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the interests of the people of the city of Detroit and the State of Michigan are affected adversely by the agitation in Congress, looking toward the reduction of the present reasonable and effective tariff on raw sugar; and

"Whereas this industry in Michigan, though in its infancy, gives promise of becoming under favorable conditions one of the most important in the State: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce and Convention League, of the city of Detroit, request our Representatives in Congress to work for the best interests of the beet-sugar industry by aiding to maintain the present tariff on sugar."

THOS. NEAL, President.
J. F. WALSH, Secretary.

HON. JOHN B. CORLISS,
Washington, D. C.

At a meeting of the board of directors of the Detroit River Sugar Company, held at its office in Detroit this 27th day of February, 1902, the following resolution was adopted, moved by Mr. John A. Russell, supported by Mr. O. R. Baldwin:

"Whereas the discussions relative to the reduction of the tariff on raw sugar imported into the United States, which reduction, in the judgment of this board of directors, threatens grievous injury to existing beet-sugar manufacturing enterprises and discouragement to capital proposing to engage in similar enterprises, has been protracted to such an extent that further delay in reaching a decision thereupon favorable to the American sugar-producing industry will make it extremely hazardous for new capital to engage in the business with a view to production during 1902; and

"Whereas the prompt decision of Congress not to reduce the tariff on raw sugar entering the United States from foreign countries would have the effect of removing the single element of doubt that now intervenes against the investment of capital in the production of sugar from beets raised in the United States: Be it

"Resolved, That the president of this company be authorized and directed to communicate with our Representatives in the Congress of the United States, asking them to use their efforts in the direction of obtaining an early expression as to the intentions of the Congress in this regard, to the end and purpose that this company's directors may be in position to correctly advise their stockholders whether or not to expend their capital in the enterprise for which it has been subscribed; and be it further

"Resolved, That the directors and stockholders of this company do hereby protest against any change in the tariff conditions affecting the importation of raw sugar into the United States, whether from Cuba or elsewhere, as being dangerous to the interests of American capital invested in manufacturing and agriculture and of American labor depending upon them for profitable occupation."

DAVID I. SIMONS, President.
O. R. BALDWIN, Vice-President.
H. E. EMMONS.
G. N. SKINNER.
JOHN A. RUSSELL.

The advocates of this measure insist that it will establish reciprocal trade relations or reciprocity with Cuba. If so, then an amendment to extend similar relations with other countries is germane. I therefore submit an amendment which I shall, at the proper time, seek to have placed upon the bill.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of line 4, page 3, the following:

"That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to enter into negotiations with Canada for reciprocal trade relations, with a view to the establishment of a commercial agreement in which reciprocal and equivalent concessions may be secured in favor of the following products and manufactures of the United States, to wit:

"Furniture, stoves, drugs, boots, shoes, steel, brass, copper, and iron manufactured products, in consideration of the admission into the United States of wood pulp, hides, and sugar beets free of duty, and lumber, barley, and iron ore at 80 per cent of the rate of duty now levied upon such articles imported from foreign countries.

"Whenever, in the judgment of the President, such reciprocal and equivalent relations have been established by agreement, he shall be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to suspend by proclamation to that effect the imposition and collection of the duties now required upon the articles above mentioned, and thereafter the duties levied, collected, and paid upon such articles shall be in accordance with the terms of said agreement."

Mr. Chairman, this amendment embraces the principles of reciprocity, as declared by the Republican party, with a country most bountifully supplied with undeveloped natural resources of great benefit to our manufacturing interests, with a people similar in character to our own. I hold in my hand a petition to the House of Representatives, prepared by the Merchants and Manufacturers' Exchange of Detroit, signed by over 500 business men, respectfully praying for the establishment of reciprocal trade relations with Canada, and which I submit in support of the amendment.

We have in this country a trust controlling wood pulp. I desire by this reciprocal trade relation to secure wood pulp free of duty. It will save thousands of dollars annually to the reading public of our country. I ask in this amendment for free hides. We have shoe manufacturing in this country with sufficient capacity to manufacture shoes for the world. Why should they pay duty on hides? We ask in this proposition for the free admission of sugar beets. Will you not give us that? I desire a reduction of the tariff on steel, iron, and other products mentioned, because the manufacturing interests of this country demand it.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] said the other day that the time was near at hand when we must meet this issue. Let us meet it now. I believe in cutting down the tariff on any product when an organization in this country is able to monopolize the trade and control the price of such article. [Applause.]

To the honorable members of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned merchants and manufacturers of Detroit, Mich., represent that a reciprocal trade agreement with the Dominion of Canada, prepared on the basis of equivalent concessions, would be of great benefit to the business interests of the United States, and they respectfully solicit your active influence to the end that such a treaty may be negotiated and ratified.

Pingree & Smith, shoe manufacturers; Edson Ulworth, wholesale dry goods; Baldwin, McGraw & Co., wholesale boots and shoes; the Peerless Manufacturing Company, wholesale furnishing goods; the Christiansen Harness Manufacturing Company, by H. A. Christiansen; F. Marnett, hardware; Illinois Glass Company, Detroit Branch, K. G. Smith, manager; Detroit Picture Frame Company, pictures and frames; Deftelger, Fallon & Co., wholesale fur manufacturers; Henry Dunneback, harness and saddlery; Hitchcock, Harris & Co., lithia waters; E. Schloss, Son & Co., wholesale clothing; Schloss Brothers, wholesale

clothing; Walter Buhl & Co., wholesale hats; Monroe Rosenfield Company, wholesale notions; R. H. Macaulay & Co., wholesale millinery; The Henry A. Newland Company, A. M. Seymour, vice-president, wholesale hats, caps, gloves, etc., and manufacturers of umbrellas; Mitchell, Harris & Co., by A. D. Mitchell, president and manager, wholesale millinery; J. & T. Hurley, coal dealers.

William G. Engle, manufacturers furs; C. H. Ritter & Co., wholesale liquors; A. Krolik & Co., wholesale dry goods; Strong, Lee & Co., wholesale dry goods; Armstrong & Graham, saddlery manufacturers; M. M. Stanton & Co., manufacturers mens' furnishing goods; Cuiso Brothers Co., Limited, wholesale grocers; F. B. Neuhoff & Co.; Imperial Cap Company, manufacturers caps; L. H. Ayers & Son; Taylor, McLeish & Co., wholesale grocers; Sales & Broad Co., plumbers and sanitary supplies; B. Marx & Son, wholesale leather findings; Standart Bros., wholesale hardware; Trade Journal Association, E. H. McPherson, publishers; C. W. Inslee & Co., wholesale grocers; Dwyer & Shay, wholesale fruits, etc.; B. G. Morris & Co., wholesale woodenware, etc.; G. W. Hildebrands & Bro., wholesale machinery; Consumers' Penny Pouch Express Company, per C. F. Crosley, president, manufacturers' advertisers; Arista Manufacturing Company, Limited, Wm. Payne, manufacturing perfumers; American Electrical Heater Company, B. H. Scranton, president, manufacturers electric heating appliances; Detroit Sanitary Supply Company, A. J. Springbone, manufacturers plumbers' supplies; A. Harvey's Sons Manufacturing Company, Limited, A. Harvey, manager, manufacturers plumbers' supplies; Geo. C. Netherbee & Co., wooden and willow ware; Fred Bamford & Co., painters and decorators.

Fred Rosenfield, wholesale leaf tobacco; Ward L. Andrews & Co., wholesale grocers; Gould & Gehlert, coffee importers; Michigan Shoe Company, by E. P. Snyder, vice-president, wholesale shoes; John Taylor & Co., wholesale saddlery; C. C. Smith Shoe Company; J. W. Fairs & Co., wholesale paper; Thorp Hawley Company, wholesale confectioners; D. K. McNaughton Company, brokers; The Geo. G. Humel Company, manufacturers hats; J. G. Hamblen, G. Humel Company, manufacturers; Pierson & Hough, wholesale saddlery; Fairbanks, Morse & Co., by E. G. Pond, manager, scales, engines, etc.; Edward Frolich Glass Company; Heinrich Brothers, wholesale clothiers; Armstrong Regalia Company, Frank S. Armstrong, vice-president, manufacturers society goods and supplies; O'Dwyer & Ward, wholesale milliners; G. N. Granger & Co., merchant discounter; Lynn Street Milling Company, flour mill; Freedman & Co., pants makers; Floyd E. Bowen & Co., brokers; Detroit Neckwear Company, A. E. Bofsky, manufacturers of neckwear; E. B. Gallagher & Co., bakers and confectioners' supplies.

Beecher, Peck & Lewis, by A. F. Peck, wholesale paper; G. H. Gates & Co., wholesale hats, caps, and gloves; A. D. Rosen & Co., wholesale notions; Paige & Chope Company, E. Stevens, treasurer, wholesale paper; Grosscup Tailoring Company, merchant tailors; Tuttle & Clark, harness and boot manufacturers; Pollock, Pettibone & Chapman, wholesale millinery; A. Kuhlman & Co., surgical instruments; C. B. Berger & Son, wholesale leaf tobacco; Seidler-Miner Electric Company, by F. J. Miner, 207 Jefferson avenue, electrical supplies; Allen Brothers, 247 Jefferson avenue, photograph materials; Fisk Rubber Company, E. H. Broadwell, manager, 252 Jefferson avenue; Detroit Rubber Tire Company, by G. D. Edwards, manager, 250 Jefferson avenue; Geo. Marsh & Co., Detroit, manufacturers of soda fountains and billiard and pool tables, 240 Jefferson avenue; Whitehead & Kales Iron Works, by J. T. Whitehead, structural-iron works; A. Booth & Co., by W. S. McDonald, wholesale fish and oysters; John Stevenson, vessel owner; Commercial Milling Company, by R. Henke, secretary and treasurer, flour and meal mills; Wm. Inglis Wire and Iron Works; Gray, Toynton & Fox, David Gray, treasurer, manufacturing confectioners; Jno. N. Bagley, tobacco manufacturers.

Mel & Schuknecht, manufacturing trunks and valises; H. J. Reading, H. J. Reading Truck Company; the Bell-Graham Company, by John Rue, secretary, skirt manufacturers; F. P. Reynolds & Co., wholesale fruits; D. O. Wiley & Co., wholesale fruits and produce; H. F. Rose & Co., wholesale fruits and produce; E. Read, wholesale fruits and produce; Ladore & Isham, wholesale fruits and produce; L. Schiappacasse & Co.; The McDonnell Bros. Company, per H. P. McDonnell, president; Freeman-Delamater Company, wholesale hardware; H. D. Edwards & Co., wholesale rubber goods; H. B. West, cigar manufacturing; S. P. Conkling, Asbestos goods; Pittsburgh Steel Shafting Company, transmission machinery; Kenneth Anderson Company, Kenneth Anderson, treasurer, jobbers of iron pipe and fittings; Robinson & Aronheim, wholesale liquor; Valentine Schroeder, wholesale candies and fruits; Gebhard Paper Company, paper and printers' supplies; O. J. Price, soda-water apparatus; The M. N. Rowley Company; Louis Kuttner Company, importers of leaf tobacco; J. T. Wing & Co., manufacturers of mill supplies; The T. W. Noble Company, C. M. Tackels, secretary and treasurer, awnings, sails, tents, etc.; Fletcher Hardware Company, per Theo. G. Fletcher, vice-president.

Roehm & Daritow, Limited, wholesale carriage goods, iron, steel, etc.; Ruess, Brace & Co., wholesale grocers; Hygeia Filter Company, manufacturers water filters; B. F. Everitt, carriage trimmings; A. Loche, manager Pabst Detroit branch; Detroit Screw Works, by H. H. Taylor, screw manufacturing; M. F. McDonald, 389 Franklin street; James Conway, grocer, 424 Franklin street; Hayes File Company, per J. S. Hayes, 474 Franklin street; The G. B. Essex Brass Company, G. B. Essex, general manager and treasurer; Buckley-Hart Manufacturing Company, Robt. W. Hart, vice-president, 541 Franklin street; The Ideal Manufacturing Company, Francis T. Dwyer, secretary, plumbing supplies and gas stoves; Buhl Malleable Company, by H. D. Laac, treasurer, malleable iron castings; The Michigan Stove Company, C. A. DuCharme, secretary, Detroit; Detroit Oak Belting Company, F. H. Cruel, general manager, 266 Wight street; John V. Moran, Lieb street and Wight; F. D. C. Hinchman, Detroit; Detroit Heating and Lighting Company, E. Hobbs.

Olds Motor Works, by Fred L. Smith, secretary; Detroit Stove Works, G. B. Gundusen, secretary; Pr. Kling Brewing Com-

- pany, Robert Kling, jr., secretary and treasurer; Detroit Emery Wheel Company; Michigan Bolt and Nut Works, by E. T. Gilbert, general manager; Cowles & Danziger Company, A. A. Cowles, secretary and treasurer; Detroit Edge Tool Works, A. E. Piefer, secretary; The Ireland & Matthews Manufacturing Company, E. Bland, secretary, steel and brass goods; Detroit Soap Company, per Samuel Post; Murphy Iron Works, by Thos. Murphy, proprietor; Detroit Automatic Stoker Company, by T. C. Thomson, treasurer; Detroit River Iron Works, by Geo. C. Synington, treasurer; Northern Engineering Works, George A. True, manager; Detroit Lumber Company, by E. L. Thompson, president, manufacturers of lumber; C. A. Taylor, National Express Company; Detroit Foundry and Manufacturing Company, F. H. Sears.
- A. A. Parker & Bro. Works, wholesale coke; W. R. Thompson, wholesale coke; C. B. Calder, Detroit Shipbuilding Company; Riverside Scrap Iron and Metal Company, per L. Goldmar; East End Boiler Works, foot of St. Aubin avenue, Detroit, boiler manufacturers; Robt. McKenzie & Son, shipsmiths; Geo. Morley & Co., lumber dealers; W. H. Anderson & Sons, by A. B. Anderson, tool manufacturers; Mannansa & Wilber, printers; W. Ingram & Co., manufacturing pharmacists; J. B. Wilson & Co., J. A. Wilson, engineers, founders, and machinists; E. A. Charbonneau & Co., picklers and preservers; Commercial Papier Mache Company, per H. L. Barie, papier mache goods; Detroit Graphite Manufacturing Company, A. A. Boutell, president, paint manufacturers; Mirror Trap Company, animal-trap manufacturers; Wilton Reuther Company, Richard Krakow, secretary, statuary and art furniture; Briscoe Manufacturing Company, per Benj. Briscoe, president, metal goods manufacturers; The Caille Brothers Company, by A. Arthur Caille, president and treasurer, manufacturers of coin-operating machines.
- Wheler Manufacturing Company, E. S. Anderson, manager, bicycle saddles and handle-bar grips; C. R. Wilson Carriage Company, C. R. Wilson, president; Wolverine Reed Company, Chas. N. Gray, treasurer, manufacturers of rattan chairs and children's carriages; Northside Coal and Lumber Company, by W. Shattock; Booth Manufacturing Company, stoned porch columns; Detroit Brass Works, general line brass goods; Farrand Organ Company, per W. R. Farrand, treasurer; The E. G. Dailey Company, E. G. Dailey, president, fruit packers; The Jas. T. Eaman Coal Company, S. B. Warren, treasurer; W. A. Sheldon, with Edw. Frohlich Glass Company; J. C. Widman & Co., per J. C. Widman, furniture and mirrors; Roe Stephens Manufacturing Company, T. P. Stephens, secretary and assistant treasurer, brass and iron valves; W. H. Grigg, box manufacturer.
- W. A. Atterbury, Detroit Steel and Spring Company; J. B. Dutton, flour mill machinery; M. J. Theisen, lumber; Wolverine Box Company, per J. N. Estabrook, box manufacturers; The Detroit Barrel Company, incorporated, per N. Haendle; Peter Rath, oil and gasoline; Jenks & Muir Manufacturing Company, by C. Jenks, president, metal beds, springs, and mattresses; American Harrow Company, O. R. Baldwin, secretary, agricultural implements; Fox Bros. & Co., C. W. Fox, manufacturers wood mantels; American Blower Company, Jas. Inglis, secretary and treasurer, manufacturers machinery; American Car and Foundry Company, by Geo. Hargreaves, district manager, car builders; The Fuller Company, engines, dynamos, and fans; Western Robe Company, per Jno. A. Chapman, manufacturers robes, coats, and astrachan cloths; Clayton & Lambert Manufacturing Company, J. E. Lambert, secretary and treasurer, makers of gasoline fire pots, torches, and hydrocarbon burners.
- The Anderson Carriage Company, by W. C. Anderson, president; Detroit Carriage Manufacturing Company, A. J. Clarke, manager sales; Acme White Lead and Color Works, Thomas Neal, secretary; Russel Wheel and Foundry Company, Detroit, Walter S. Russel; Continental Varnish and Paint Company, per Butler Ives, secretary; Schwanbeck Brothers, E. E. Mansfield, manufacturers of show cases; F. A. Thompson & Co., F. A. Thompson, manager, manufacturing chemists; American Radiator Company, T. B. Howell, assistant manager Michigan plant; Murphy Chair Company, M. J. Murphy, president, manufacturers of chairs.
- The Puritan Shoe Company, S. C. Jameson, treasurer, shoe manufacturers; S. C. Jameson, merchant; W. F. Wilson, the Yale Hat Company; Liny's Music House firm, pianos; the Adolph Enggass Jewelry Company, Ad. Enggass, secretary, 22 Gratiot avenue; C. W. Marvin Piano Company; Rudolph Freedenberg, ex-Gratiot, woollens, tailors' trimmings; Geo. H. Parker, wool, hides, etc.; P. M. Doyle, commercial traveler; Broadwell & Wolf, music business; Edward J. Nebel, leather and findings; Edward C. Blordon, furnishing goods; John Radke, boots and shoes; Geo. J. Setance, sheet nickel work; Charles Martin, machine works; Wm. Liebig & Co., machine shop; the J. L. Hudson Company, W. A. Petzold, treasurer, general merchandise; W. A. Petzold.
- Tierney Bros., 219 Woodward avenue, dry goods; Electrical Construction Co., George T. Crook, electrical supplies; Alex. Y. Malcomson, coal merchant; James Couzens, secretary the A. Y. Malcomson Company, Limited; E. N. Bartlett, 174 Griswold street; J. Bishop, 1034 Thirteenth street; J. H. Gabell & Bro., shoes, 24 Michigan avenue; the General Typewriter Company, 165 Griswold street; R. G. Morgan, 322 Majestic Building; City and Suburban Homes Company, Limited, R. M. Grindley, 171 Griswold street; J. O. Hibbard, 171 Griswold street; J. H. Bessinger, 210 Griswold street; A. A. Moore, 210 Griswold street; D. L. Hempsted, hats and caps; H. W. Groat, 173 Griswold street; Wm. A. Hall, drugs, 177 Griswold street; Wm. H. Miller & Co., wholesale furs; Miller-Seldon Electric Company, William H. Seldon, jr., electrical supply dealers; Gourlay Bros., men's furnisiers and ladies' tailors; Royal Shoe Company, shoes; R. H. Traver, 171-175 Woodward avenue; R. H. Pfee & Co., shoes, 182-185 Woodward avenue; Edward J. Hickey, clothing, etc., 201 Woodward avenue; Frank Bros. & Co., jewelers, 205 Woodward avenue; Winn & Hammond, 152 Wayne street, printers and binders; Carlos C. Ayres, 45 State street, cigar manufacturer; Ballantine & Co., 39 Rowland street, tailors.
- Johnson & Foster, tobacconists; A. E. Charlesworth, manufacturing optician; C. S. Warwick, manufacturer gloves; Blakeslee & Co., household furnishings; W. E. Jackson, printing; The Gately Company, clothing; British American Gold and Copper Mining Company, per J. M. Sweeney, secretary and treasurer; Edw. J. Renaud, Hotel Renaud; Detroit Churn and Separator Company, per E. E. Deming, manufacturers; D. Waugh, coal and wood; Gray Brothers, per J. Allan Gray, secretary, carriages and wagons; Crescent Machine Company, Wm. A. Gray, secretary and manager; Wm. White, grocery; E. G. Scholes, shoe dealer; Howard Pinkerton, druggist; American Winger Company, household specialties, per H. C. Frank, manager; Wolverine Cycle Company, C. Ege, manager, bicycle manufacturers; H. W. Becker, furrier; W. T. Stark, bookkeeper; Andrew Hair; L. O. H. Fisher, china; W. T. Ryan, 297 Woodward avenue; E. Daniel, cigar dealer; A. J. Gawly & Co., cigar dealers.
- Miller & Gray, 333 and 335 Woodward avenue; James P. Mastin, 337 Woodward avenue; Charles Roe, 47 Columbia street west; Henry Busscher, 341 Woodward avenue; Jno. Blessed, 347-357 Woodward avenue; Wm. W. Blessed, 347-357 Woodward avenue; John Harvey, druggist, 353 and 355 Woodward avenue; Chas. R. Brand, painter, 359 Woodward avenue; Simons & Cooper, 371 Woodward avenue; Wm. Wing, 407 Woodward avenue; Max Grabowsky, 380 Woodward avenue; Morris Grabowsky, hardware, 378 Woodward avenue; V. Kennedy, 374 Woodward avenue; Chas. Kline, hardware; Diamond Rubber Company, rubber goods, 310 Woodward avenue; Scharlie & Stock, florists, 308 Woodward avenue; The Michigan Clothing Cleaning and Repairing Company, 306 Woodward avenue; A. A. Hare, furnaces, 300 Woodward avenue; G. V. Potter, 296 Woodward avenue; Brown & Brown, coal, 294 Woodward avenue; Ashbaugh, Dillrich & Co., wholesale furs; John J. Gorman, retail hats; John O. Teagan, vessel owner; Mohan Bros., 63 Home Bank Building; P. J. Schmidt, shoe retailer, 42 Michigan avenue; People's Outfitting Company, per S. Wine-man, treasurer, house furnisiers.
- Thos. O. McCarthy, cutter, McConnell Tailor Company; Henry Heinlein, cutter, McConnell Tailor Company; L. F. Weiss, hatter and furnisher; Keves & Grobbel, umbrella makers; Hiram Van Loon, auction and commission merchant; L. E. Wagoner, furniture dealer; J. D. Larcen, furniture dealer; J. C. Edwards, live-stock dealer; G. A. Leannel, furniture; Bentley & Hubbard, per T. P. Hubbard, wall-paper merchants; F. A. Hubbard & Co., painters and decorators; Harry C. Bell, 300 West High; Onstal Optical Company, 118 Michigan avenue; A. E. Gerow, harness and bicycles; C. G. Howe, confectionery; Grand Union Tea Company, C. W. Osman, manager, 140 Michigan avenue; Philip Frese, 142 Michigan avenue, manufacturer of cigars; W. H. Ziegenfus, manufacturer of cigars; E. C. Loring; A. A. Franke, caterer; V. L. Chapin, furniture; J. R. Pengelly, jobber of tobacco and cigars, 166 Michigan avenue; R. Walters, cigar manufacturer; W. Lavery, butter and eggs, tea and coffee; J. Jewett, restaurant, 147 Fifteenth street; H. F. Koehler & Bro., wall paper and painters' supplies, 174 and 176 Michigan avenue.
- Wm. Dupont, druggist, 182 Michigan avenue; F. H. Jost, furs, 186 Michigan avenue; Gail Alden, furniture, 206 Michigan avenue; Charles Mahler, grocer, 220 Michigan avenue; John Chrystal, traveler, 391 Cass avenue; W. F. Thatcher, confectioner, 256 Michigan avenue; J. P. Cotter, druggist, 262 Michigan avenue; C. E. Pokomy, tailor, 278 Michigan avenue; Chas. Shaw, 280 Michigan avenue; Alfred Reed, 296 Grand River; Chas. Burke, cigars, 290 Michigan avenue; James Hamfan, bicycles, 304 Michigan avenue; Thomas Cooney, coal, 310 Michigan avenue; S. H. Graham, 327 Michigan avenue; Jno. R. Morrissey, 169 Fifth street; A. J. Neidenwich, hardware, 315 Michigan avenue; Daniel Sullivan, grocer, 311 Michigan avenue; Guilloz & Son, bakers, 309 Michigan avenue; J. A. Munn, grocer, 297 Michigan avenue; G. A. Mueller, dry goods, 295 Michigan avenue; I. G. Stark, shoe bits, 295 Michigan avenue; Frank Deck, tailor, 259 Michigan avenue; G. Finger, furniture, 257 Michigan avenue; C. M. Carker, 83 Labrosse street; Lewis D. Barker, 11 Gilman street; J. W. Lapham, furniture, 227 Michigan avenue; J. B. Lapham, furniture, 229 Michigan avenue.
- M. A. Dowling, 332 Foot street west; L. L. Lamba, 225 Michigan avenue; Saml. Nash, 80 Howard street; Wm. Perry, confectioner, 221 Michigan avenue; S. A. Gates, picture framing, 209 Michigan avenue; J. P. Bought, with Gunnell Bros., 221 Woodward avenue; J. Johnson, cigars and tobacco, 203 Michigan avenue; J. Goldstine, dyer and clothier, 201 Michigan avenue; Chas. Kovan, 197 Michigan avenue, tailor; T. M. Edgar, 195 Michigan avenue, general merchandise; Geo. A. Sideau, 179 Michigan avenue, gents and ladies' furnishings; Zimmel, 167 Michigan avenue, cigar manufacturer; R. Allet, 167 Michigan avenue, clothier; T. H. Berry, 169 Michigan avenue, carpets; Geo. L. Freeman, 39 Smith avenue, Detroit, Mich.; M. Roney, 146 Charlotte avenue; Jacobs & Covitz, clothiers, 163 Michigan avenue; Detroit Specialty Company, 161 Michigan avenue; Jacob Steinberg, 157 Michigan avenue, clothier; J. C. Wilson Carriage Company, 28 and 30 Abbott street; Daniel Anglin, 139 Michigan avenue, jeweler; H. P. Beardsley, 135 Michigan avenue; F. L. Saper, clothier, 135 Michigan avenue; Wm. P. Blake, 15 Abbott street; P. Blake's Sons, 15-17 Abbott street; David Wilson, 527 Warren avenue west; P. Blake, 15 Abbott street.
- Chas. E. Bleakley, M. D., 9 Abbott street; Wolverine M. S. Company, J. E. Moore, 529 Michigan avenue; D. E. Pearsall, 123 Michigan avenue, tobacco dealer; R. Downie & Sons, 117 and 119 Michigan avenue; Roger J. Sullivan & Co., furniture, carpets, and stoves, 113 and 115 Michigan avenue; F. A. Cooke, drugs, 111 Michigan avenue; Edwin Jerome & Co., 97 Michigan avenue; James Johnston, 29 Ash street; H. Jackson & Co., 95 Michigan avenue; Thomas Nelan, 854 Antons street; Detroit Photographic Supply Company, by H. W. Moore, 28 Lafayette avenue; H. S. Simpson, manager United Typewriter and Supplies Company, 28 Lafayette avenue; J. E. Searight, assistant manager United Typewriter and Supplies Company, 26 Lafayette avenue; W. B. Jackson, 26 Lafayette avenue; James W. Candler, 26 Lafayette avenue; Homer W. Candler, 26 Lafayette avenue; National Mortgage Loan Company, 23 Lafayette avenue; C. H. Crawford, shoes, 25 Michigan avenue; Union Painless Dentists, C. H. Butler, 11 Lafayette avenue; H. A. Sage, 171 Howard street; John Hellerich, jeweler, 139 Michigan avenue; Detroit Art Company, per A. A. Mann, art goods; Detroit Book Exchange, per I. N. Higgins; Harris & Petre, hardware, 71 Michigan avenue.
- L. Wiener, merchant, 77-85 Michigan avenue; Sumner Company,

- 348, 350, 352 Michigan avenue, furniture; H. W. Stoll, 372 Michigan avenue, confectioner; Geo. C. Becker & Co., 376-380 Michigan avenue, furniture; James Hamlin, 386 Michigan avenue; C. J. Wagstaff, 388 Michigan avenue, shoes; A. H. Rose, 416 Michigan avenue, builder; Henatine Medical Company, I. M. T. Hannum, 420 Michigan avenue; Hamilton Furniture Company, Michigan avenue and Tenth street; M. Ascher, grocer, 502 Michigan avenue; Jos. Klute, 514 Michigan avenue; Chas. Colpew, grocer, 522 Michigan avenue; L. McFarland, 528 Michigan avenue, druggist; W. V. Humphry, bakery, 536 Michigan avenue; T. J. Irwin, confectioner, 542 Michigan avenue; D. A. Henderson, 580 Michigan avenue; Wm. Kane, 592 Michigan avenue; S. Schadin, 600 Eighteenth street; B. Rowe, confections, 592 Michigan avenue; W. W. Burk, cigars, 594 Michigan avenue; Jos. Merrill & Bro., grocers, 638 Michigan avenue; E. C. Jutrock, jeweler, 644 Michigan avenue; Speck Brothers, furniture and carpets, 654, 686 Michigan avenue.
- Chas. H. Heath, coal and feed, 704 Michigan avenue; G. E. Rigley, fish dealer, 712 Michigan avenue; E. Bogatzky, bakery, 714 Michigan avenue; Andrew Baetz, 1102 Twenty-fifth street; M. Crowley, produce, 808 Michigan avenue; Jos. Huettemann, 812 Michigan avenue; Osgood Printing Company, 823 Michigan avenue; H. W. Osgood, 231 Hubbard avenue; A. Walldorf, druggist, 838 Michigan avenue; G. W. Stringer, pharmacist, 865 Michigan avenue; J. H. Keeper, Hammond Beef Company, 885 Michigan avenue; C. C. Chadwick, coal, 1453 Fourteenth avenue; P. H. Zacharias, coal, corner Michigan avenue and Twentieth street; John Stegskial, 809 Michigan avenue; Hallock Orsland, 808 Michigan avenue; Waler Eggs and Poultry Company, 797 Michigan avenue; Lee Doran & Co., wholesale grocers, 789 Michigan avenue; B. E. Graham, 665 Michigan avenue; Elster & O'Toole, wallpaper, 663 Michigan avenue; W. H. Rowe, printer, 639 Michigan avenue; S. H. Dibble, 637 Michigan avenue; James F. Leake, 629 Michigan avenue; Fred. Feldman, 605 Michigan avenue; C. H. Baker, confectionery, 449 Michigan avenue; H. P. Lyon, gent's furnishings, 375 Michigan avenue.
- Harry Lando, secondhand stoves, 363 Michigan avenue; John H. Fitzsimmons, cigar manufacturer, 341 Michigan avenue; F. W. Baumgartner, haberdasher and hatter, 12 and 14 State street; Burks Grain and Elevator Company, Chamber of Commerce; F. J. Simmons & Co., Chamber of Commerce; Jno. A. Boyd, loan agent; A. J. Ellair Company, grain merchant; Cash Buyers' Discount Company, advertising specialties; Caughey & Carran, grain merchants; J. S. Lapham & Co., grain merchants; H. S. Prince, State agent Fort Wayne and Ontario Line and Ontario Dispatch; Geo. H. Braun, architect; Account, Audit, and Assurance Company, Limited, by N. A. Hawkins, manager, auditors and accountants; The International Amusement Stamp Company, of Detroit, Mich., Limited, commission advertising; American Engineering Company, engineering, N. F. Palmieter, president, D. W. Mason, secretary and treasurer, T. J. Greene, general manager; J. H. Lusey, Chamber of Commerce; J. H. Cummings & Co., Chamber of Commerce; S. B. Coleman, Chamber of Commerce; Thos. Milsoun, Chamber of Commerce.
- J. J. Alley, retired; C. M. Havens, merchant; Chas. A. Berkey, wholesale jewelry; Julius Gmeiner, jeweler; Gmeiner & Schroeder, jewelers; D. E. Reilly, cashier Detroit River Savings Bank; R. L. Polk & Co., publishers; W. J. Milward, railroad; J. H. Smith, broker; J. W. Dean, State agent Shredded Wheat; Louis J. Wöhllich, mechanic; Bennett Stamp and Stencil Works, by H. T. Bennett, treasurer; Wm. Partridge, blank book manufacturer; Thos. Hill, Merchants' Dispatch Transportation Company; E. E. Haskell, civil engineer; M. L. Williams, vice-president Commercial National Bank; Frank H. West, printer; Edward N. Hines, Presten Speaker Printing Company; Weet & Redelsheimer, wholesale paper; D. T. Smith, with S. A. James & Co.
- Alex. Galloway, with Jacob Zage, plumber; The Western Paper Box Company, by Louis Drelees, manager, 68 W. Larned; Webster, Harrigan & Reid, 71-73 Shelby street; C. S. Dent & Co., by G. L. Devlin; Wm. Cornehl & Son, 77 Larned, bookbinder; F. S. Davis, broker; Jno. Woodhouse & Co., 89 Woodward avenue, wholesale tobacconists; C. F. Whitaker, Avenue Theater Building; J. A. Macks & Co., sporting goods; E. H. Pudrith, wholesale jeweler; L. J. Callahan, 95 Woodward avenue; Michigan Electric Company, by E. Bullock, secretary and treasurer, Michigan Electric Company, by H. F. de B. Cameron, 101 Woodward; L. B. King & Co., by John G. Lankel, treasurer, 103 Woodward; David Wallace & Son, grocers, 105 Woodward avenue; Partridge & Walsh, 107 and 109 Woodward avenue; The Baillie Coal Company, per Robt. L. Baile, secretary and treasurer, 94 Griswold street; M. Gore Van Antwerp, 273 East Congress; S. A. Fraser, Griswold street; W. N. Krug, 883 McKinstry avenue.
- Morton Stencil Company, stencil and stamp manufacturers; John L. Harper & Co., bankers; Ralph Stone, assistant secretary, Detroit Trust Company; A. G. Lindsay, insurance; The Detroit Fire and Marine Insurance Company, by A. H. McDonell, secretary, insurance; S. W. Gurney, agent Buhl Building; The Norris Company, Fredk. H. Norris, secretary and manager, 102-6 Lomed W.; Detroit Stay Company, G. S. Brown, secretary and treasurer; Rosengarten & Co., 75 W. Fort street; H. P. Magel, real estate, 211 Hammond Building; J. A. Mercier, contractor, Hammond Building; F. C. Barkenan, insurance; J. P. Cummiskey, G. S. A., The O. W. Shipman Company; Hermann Mayer Manufacturing Company, school supplies and furniture; Welch Brothers, 313 Hammond Building; John M. Nicol, real estate; F. B. Holmes & Co., fire brick and cement; E. J. Robinson, 418 Hammond Building; S. B. Macklem, 418 Hammond Building; G. Ellsworth Burkit, 426 Hammond Building.
- Geo. W. House, sales agent; M. W. O'Brien, president Peoples' Savings Bank; C. L. Wheelock, accident insurance; J. Wm. Garrison, broker; C. F. Livermore, railroad accountant; George M. Crocker; Joseph B. Moore, insurance and real estate; Geo. M. Schettler, druggist; Alderman & Gorton, investment securities; A. W. Glass, investment securities; E. U. Donovan, general manager Ideal Reserve; Michigan Sulphite Fibre Company, P. S. Curtis, secretary; Wm. E. Yates, insurance; L. W. Partridge, real estate and mining; The A. Marymont Company, wholesale liquor; Thomas Dillon, life insurance; H. S. Weisinger, contractor; Sprague Publishing Company per J. Corterno, jr., secretary and treasurer, publishers; Jas. A. Randall, attorney; A. Campbell, mining agent; Globe Paper Company, H. Blumenthal, secretary and treasurer; Detroit Trolley and Manufacturing Company; Globe House Furnishing Company; Chas. A. King, merchant tailor.
- J. I. Carter & Co., salt manufacturers; George J. Worthy & Co., bankers and brokers; J. G. Wise, insurance; A. Maxwell Lyon, manager G. E. Insurance Company; H. Hitchcock, agent; E. S. Matthews, manager Otis Elevator Company; The Wells Creek Coal Company, B. F. Berry, president, miners of coal; The Southern Coal and Transportation Company, N. O. Gray, general manager, coal operators; The Northern Coal and Transportation Company, by James Irwin, treasurer, coal miners; A. B. Hall, assistant corporation counsel; Marcel E. Hude, stenographer, corporation counsel; F. E. Bloom, insurance; Geo. A. Woodford Sons, brokers; E. E. Hatch, woolens; Wm. S. Pond, general manager National Life Insurance Company of Vermont; T. B. Goodwillie, real estate; G. L. Cottingham, merchant tailor; J. Mott, merchant tailor; G. H. Smith, clerk Central Construction Company; The Detroit Refining Company, lubricating oils, paints, etc.; The Hannan Real Estate Exchange, per W. W. Hannan, 1 McGraw Building; John D. Murphy, manager life insurance company; E. J. McKendree, broker; The F. H. Wolf Brick Company.
- W. D. Bishop, life insurance; H. W. Busch, coal; T. B. Ray & Co., hardware; American Paint and Glass Company, P. J. Brennan, treasurer; John McLean, 50 East Elgin; Williams, Davis, Brooks & Hinchman Sons, William C. Williams, president, wholesale druggists and perfumers; The Chas. A. Strelinger Company, per J. S. Capen, secretary; Detroit Emery Wheel Company, emery wheels and machinery; Raynor & Taylor, John Taylor, president, printing and binding; Burnham Scovel & Co., wholesale dry goods; The Schulenburg Manufacturing Company, R. Schulenburg, secretary and treasurer, manufacturers of billiard balls; E. Chope & Sons, manufacturers of wagons and trucks; Banner Cigar Manufacturing Company, W. H. B.; J. A. Mowat; Harrington Cigar Company, per F. E. Hempberry, secretary and treasurer, cigar manufacturers; Monnier Cycle Supply Company, per C. S. Monnier, proprietor, wholesale bicycle supplies; Central Paint and Glass Company, H. A. Neal, manager; The Muzzy-Lyon Company, per J. H. Muzzy, mill supplies; McIntosh, Crane & Co., C. H. Schulte, secretary and treasurer, manufacturing confectioners.
- G. A. Lendke, shoe business; D. M. Ferry & Co., Lem W. Bowen, treasurer and general manager, seedsmen; The Boydell Bros. White Lead and Color Company, John Boydell, president, paint manufacturers; The Detroit Electro Plating Company, H. G. Harris, secretary and treasurer, plating; Dodge Brothers, by Jno. F. Dodge, engineers and machinists; The Osborn Cash Register Company, Limited, George Martland, manager, manufacturers cash registers; Hygienic Seat Company, John H. French, secretary, manufacturers steel closet seats; Michigan Stamping Company, John H. French, treasurer, manufacturers metal specialties; The Schreiner-Yates, manufacturers novelties; Michigan Cigar Box Company, by Jno. A. Campbell, manufacturers cigar boxes; John Phillips & Co., Limited, by H. Malott, treasurer, manufacturers show cases; Michigan Bung Company, manufacturers bungs; Standard Manufacturing Company, A. H. Reinhold, manager, metal specialties.
- Loyal American Cigar Manufacturing Company, N. Van Vliet, proprietor; A. K. Sweet & Co., painters and decorators; Rumsey Wool Stock Company, wool stock dealers; Robert Hutton & Co., roofing and sheet metal works; John Lauer, machinist; Globe Tobacco Company, W. R. Hamper, secretary and treasurer, manufacturers tobacco; N. J. White & Co., color card manufacturers; Detroit Alaska Knitting Mills, R. Berg, 69-71 East Larned; Theo. H. Eaton & Son, 28 Woodward avenue, 324, 326, 330 Franklin street; Brady & Co., 7, 9, and 11 Woodward avenue, Detroit; J. C. Goss & Co., sailmaker and rigger, 10 Atwater street, Detroit, Mich.; Schadt & Mathewson, 36 Woodward avenue, wholesale feathers, bed pillows, and down cushions; American Lady Corset Company, J. Siegel & Co., corsets; Greenslade Oil Company, T. H. Stephens, oils; Jas. Walker & Son, John Walker, 43 Jefferson avenue and 129-131 Larned street west; Clarence H. Booth, corner Wayne and Congress streets; Horace W. Steere, jeweler; Geo. A. Blum, cigars, tobacco; E. E. Jones, 85 Woodward avenue; Elias M. Rothman, 90 Woodward avenue; Geo. Moebis & Co., 82 Woodward avenue.
- Alex. Paton, hardware; T. B. Rayl Company, hardware; Sol Beriman, misfit clothing parlor; W. H. Bedard, The Regal Shoe Company; O'Brian & Co., 127-129 Woodward avenue; Fred Sanders, confectioner, 141 Woodward; Daniel C. Grobbel, Peerless Specialty Company; Ed. La Dancour, clothing; M. J. Ciganet, 49 Monroe avenue, hatter; A. Finsterwald, 67 Monroe avenue, clothier; I. J. Keltch, clothier; Grunow & Patterson, drugs; Gus. W. Hartman, hatter and furnisher; John P. Lieberman & Co., 84 Gratiot avenue; Chas. P. Brant, 96 Gratiot avenue; Union Hat Company, 102 Gratiot avenue; Thomas Walsh, 104-106 Gratiot; W. W. Bagg, jeweler, 118 Gratiot avenue; C. J. Merbach, 122 Gratiot avenue, boots and shoes; Herman Spater, 124 Gratiot avenue; Chas. Feldmann, 126 Gratiot avenue; W. J. Clifford, 132 Gratiot; Jones, Roser & Alder, 138 Gratiot avenue, leather and findings; A. Quandt, 133 Gratiot avenue; Brede & Schroeter, painters and decorators, 152 Gratiot avenue.
- Geo. Voilrath, hardware; Otto Simon, jeweler; Benjamin F. Rose, 180 Gratiot avenue; Wettlaufer Bros., tailors and importers, 192 Gratiot avenue; W. B. Jansen, dry goods, 194-200 Gratiot avenue; Spindler Son, wall paper, 210 Gratiot avenue; Detroit Novelty Cloak Company, 230 Gratiot avenue, J. Miller; A. Barron, 222 Gratiot avenue, hardware, tin, crockery and glassware; S. E. Werner, millinery, 226 Gratiot avenue; F. Deinzer & Son, Naph House, 232 Gratiot avenue; Herm. Beese & Co., 240 Gratiot; C. Jacobson, 235 Gratiot; Hugo J. Denk, picture frame manufacturer; J. F. Weber, lumber; Detroit Candy Company, Limited, F. Winter, manager; S. Goldstein & Co., 285 Gratiot avenue; F. W. Droelle, druggist, 271 Gratiot avenue; John Benshaber, furniture, 261-263 Gratiot avenue; Beriman, Meine & Co., wholesale clothing; Fred Benshuyn, manufacturing confectioner, 245-251 Gratiot avenue; Geo. J. Heck, job printer; A. W. Richards, tea company; J. S. Jennings, tailor.

Marr & Taylor, dry goods; Macauley Bros., booksellers; Jno. H. Harvey, manager W. L. Douglas Shoe Company; W. E. Barker & Co., furniture, 178 Woodward avenue; New York Suit, Cloak and Fur Company, suits, cloaks, and furs, 182 Woodward avenue; Newcomb Endicott Company, dry goods, 190 Woodward avenue; Thos. J. Walsh, jeweler, 202 Woodward avenue; S. C. Dunlin & Co., opticians, 210 Woodward avenue; White Sewing Machine Company, sewing machines; Geo. L. Robinson, manager, bicycles and automobiles; J. B. Mulhall, English Woolen Mills Company; J. B. Aldrich, manager Standard Sewing Machine Company; Samuel Smith, merchant tailor; Geo. F. Trunk, 248 Woodward avenue; F. G. Barton & Co., mantels, grates, and fixtures; L. A. Howard, 41 East Elizabeth; W. C. Rands & Co., 254 Woodward avenue; Andrew Hain, caterer, 258 Woodward avenue; The J. F. Hartz Co., manufacturers of surgical instruments; L. P. H. Fisher, china, 272 Woodward avenue; Theodore C. Mau, furrier, 209 Woodward avenue; Geo. E. Angell, confectioner, 235 Woodward avenue; F. T. Collier, pianos, 124-126 Miami avenue; Goldberg Bros., department store, 225-7-9 Woodward avenue; Grinnell Bros., music store, 219-223 Woodward avenue.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, the people of my district are especially interested in the measure now pending before Congress. Generally the people of Louisiana, though in a less degree, are vitally interested in the issues involved by the passage of this measure; but in discussing this measure I shall not limit myself purely to the local bearing this bill may have on my constituents, nor shall I limit my argument with the effect it might have upon the people of Louisiana, which in part I represent, but I hope to take a broader ground and to discuss this question from a broad rather than a local standpoint.

I may preface my remarks with the statement that from the first tariff act—that of July 4, 1789—enacted by the Congress of the United States until the tariff act of 1890 no tariff legislation has been passed by the American Congress that did not impose a substantial tariff upon sugars imported into this country. I make an exception of the tariff act of 1890, because that tariff act put sugar on the free list. Yet at the same time, in order to give that industry an equality of standing in the market with other industries benefited by tariff legislation, a bounty of 2 cents on refined sugars and of 1½ cents on inferior grades was paid the domestic sugar growers of this country. The bounty schedule of that tariff was opposed at that time by the Louisiana sugar producers.

The reason for the opposition was that it was thought that a bounty would not meet with the general approval of the people of the United States. Against the protest of the sugar producers of Louisiana this bounty was given, and then there was a provision placed in the bill which provided that the President of the United States, by proclamation, might declare a tariff upon sugars coming from countries where, in his opinion, a discrimination was made by the tariff legislation of such country against the introduction of American manufactured goods into it, and the President of the United States was authorized, by proclamation, to legislate and to impose a tariff upon goods coming from such country, and then to cancel this proclamation tariff by enacting reciprocity treaties with the countries discriminating against American manufactured goods. That tariff became law in 1890.

It is my purpose to demonstrate that neither Republican nor Democrat should vote for this measure, nor should any American give it his support. The Republican members should not vote for it because it contemplates a violation of good faith, by that party, with the domestic sugar producer.

In 1890, when the tariff on sugar was abandoned for the first time, as I have related, paragraph 231 of that bill, commonly known as the McKinley bill, gave a bounty on sugars as follows:

Sugars not below 90° polariscope, 2 cents per pound.

Sugars between 80° and 90° polariscope, 1½ cents per pound.

Paragraph 726 placed sugars not above 16 Dutch standard, which is commonly known as raw sugar, on the free list.

By paragraph 237 sugars above 16 Dutch standard, which is known as refined sugar, five-tenths of a cent per pound duty was imposed.

And where the sugar was imported into this country from a country which placed a bounty on such sugars, then a countervailing duty of one-tenth of a cent per pound was placed in addition to the five-tenths cent just mentioned.

Then came section 3, authorizing the President by proclamation to place a duty on sugar and one or two other articles mentioned in the section when coming from a country where it was desired to have a treaty of reciprocity enacted between such country and the United States, and upon the adoption of such a treaty by the two countries to remove that duty. The section fixed the extent to which the President could by proclamation enact tariff legislation against such country as he desired to enter into reciprocal trade.

Sugars not above 13 Dutch standard and not above 75° polariscope paid a duty of seven-tenths of a cent per pound, and for each additional degree of the polariscope was added two one-hundredths of a cent per pound.

Sugars above 13 Dutch standard and not above 16 Dutch standard, 1½ cents per pound.

Sugars above 16 Dutch standard and not above 20 Dutch standard, 1½ cents per pound.

Above 20 Dutch standard, 2 cents per pound.

In 1892 the Democratic party in convention at Chicago adopted in its platform the following plank, which has special relation to this section of the McKinley law. That plank, section 4, reads as follows:

Trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating is a time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith, but we denounce the sham reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchanges by pretending to establish closer trade relations for a country whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products with other countries that are also agricultural, while erecting a custom-house barrier of prohibitive tariff taxes against the richest of the countries of the world, that stand ready to take our entire surplus of products and to exchange therefor commodities which are necessities and comforts of life among our own people.

In 1893 the Democrats came into power, and in 1894 what was known as the Wilson bill was enacted. In that bill sugar was restored to the dutiable list and the bounty was repealed. The sugar-schedule provision in that bill was as follows:

Paragraph 182½ imposed a tariff on all sugars imported into this country of 40 per cent ad valorem. Then there was a differential in favor of refined—that is, covering all sugars above 16 Dutch standard, on which sugars a duty of one-eighth cent per pound was added to the 40 per cent ad valorem; and again there was a countervailing duty—that is, where sugars came from a country paying any kind of a bounty to the domestic producer of that country, then one-tenth of a cent per pound additional was placed upon such sugars.

The reciprocity clause of the McKinley law, which was section 3 of the act of 1890, was by section 71 repealed in so many words.

This was looked upon by the Republicans as a breaking of faith by the Democratic party with the domestic sugar producer, and that feeling found expression in the national Republican platform of 1896. The plank relating to that section of the Wilson bill repealing section 3 of the act of 1890 reads as follows:

We believe the repeal of the reciprocity arrangements negotiated by the last Republican Administration was a national calamity, and we demand their renewal and extension on such terms as will equalize our trade with other nations, remove the restrictions which now obstruct the sale of American products in the ports of other countries, and secure enlarged markets for the products of our farms, forests, and factories.

Protection and reciprocity are twin measures of Republican policy and go hand in hand. Democratic rule has recklessly struck down both, and both must be reestablished. Free admission for the necessities of life which we do not produce; reciprocity agreements of mutual interests which again open markets for us in return for our open markets to others. Protection builds up domestic industry and trade and secures our own markets for ourselves; reciprocity builds up our foreign trade and finds an outlet for our surplus.

We condemn the present Administration for not keeping faith with the sugar producers of this country. The Republican party favors such protection as will lead to the production on American soil of all the sugar which the American people use, and for which they pay other countries more than \$100,000,000 annually.

In 1897, the Republicans securing control of the Government, the Dingley law was enacted that same year. The Republican party again returned to the doctrine of reciprocity, though the method of applying that doctrine was changed from the method which had prevailed under the McKinley law. Paragraph 209 of the Dingley law placed a tariff on sugars not above 16 Dutch standard and not above 75° polariscope at ninety-five one-hundredths of a cent per pound, and provided an additional thirty-five one-thousandths of a cent per pound for every additional degree of the polariscope. That established, the scale of tariff upon sugar per 100 pounds was as follows:

	Cents.		Cents.
75°	0.95	88°	1.405
76°	.985	89°	1.44
77°	1.02	90°	1.475
78°	1.055	91°	1.51
79°	1.09	92°	1.545
80°	1.125	93°	1.58
81°	1.16	94°	1.615
82°	1.195	95°	1.65
83°	1.23	96°	1.685
84°	1.265	97°	1.72
85°	1.30	98°	1.755
86°	1.335	99°	1.79
87°	1.37	100°	1.825

Then there was, by the same section, a differential duty allowed (that is, refined sugars, or sugars above 16 Dutch standard, regardless of the polariscopic test, received a flat duty of \$1.95 per 100 pounds); and then there was a countervailing duty, which in that law was fixed on the equivalent of whatever bounty was paid by the country from whence the sugar came; and then there was a reciprocity section, which enabled the President, by reciprocal trade arrangements with other countries, to reduce this tariff 20 per cent, provided the reciprocity should not continue for more than five years, and fixing the limit of time—two years—within which such treaty should be enacted by the President. Hence it is that the President can not to-day, under this

provision, enact a treaty of reciprocity with Cuba without the proposed action on the part of Congress as defined in this bill.

When this bill was pending before the House prominent members on the Republican side, in their several speeches upon the bill, all declared that the purpose of this provision of the tariff bill was to renew the faith that had been broken, as they claimed, by the Democratic party with the American sugar producer by the passage of the Wilson bill, and to carry out the platform declaration of their party, as I have read it a while ago.

Mr. GROSVENOR said, in his speech of March 24, 1897:

There is not a principle involved in its formation, not a condition suggested in its ramification, not a rate of duty, not a principle of tariff taxation that has not been protested against by the sugar trust and fought to the bitter end before the Committee on Ways and Means.

We propose that instead of sending \$125,000,000 a year to the foreign countries of the world, most of which goes to pay labor in the production of sugar, we will make it possible for every pound of sugar that we want to be produced in the United States of America.

The Republican party comes and offers to the agriculturists of this country this magnificent boon. We will protect the industries of the country in all directions from further demoralization, and we ask you to turn aside hundreds of thousands of acres of the splendid lands of all of these States from the production of corn, oats, wheat, potatoes, and cotton, to be put into an already overstocked market, to the production of sugar, and give to the farmers upon the farming lands of the country a better market with less competition than they now have.

On the next day Mr. STEELE said:

With regard to sugar, I predict that if the tariff fixed by this bill is unchanged for a period of ten years, we will at the end of that time be producing not only enough for our own consumption, but as much as we care to export, and at very little additional cost to the consumer.

On the same day Mr. PAYNE said:

Mr. Chairman, I will tell the House how we propose to reduce revenue when it becomes necessary to do so, but I can only hint at it now, as my remaining time is so limited. We propose to take off five or six millions a year of duty on the linen that we import by producing it in this country and not having to pay any duty upon it, because it will not be imported. [Applause on the Republican side.] We propose to raise beet sugar and cane sugar enough in this country to supply all our 73,000,000 people, who must have the best in the world, and in that way we will take off \$50,000,000 in the course of a few years.

On July 19, 1897, both Mr. Dingley, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and Mr. PAYNE, then member and now chairman of said committee, used this very significant language. Mr. PAYNE said:

What shall be done with the sugar trust? Well, I will tell you what, in my opinion, is the best way of dealing with it. Establish a beet-sugar factory in every Congressional district in the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.] Give competition and lots of it everywhere. Put the farmers over against the trust by passing this bill and reduce the price of sugar so that German raw sugar can not be brought in to be refined here.

Gentlemen on the other side, come over and help us, while we help the farmers out. [Laughter and applause.] You grangers over there, come and help us. You Populists, that go up and down the streets day after day proclaiming your devotion to the interests of the farmers, help us out now when we are trying to help the farmers in this industry that we can establish so successfully. In this way you will do something toward demolishing the trust. You will accomplish more in this way than by mere invective—by running windmills, and all that. [Laughter and applause.]

Why should we not produce all of our sugar in this country? Why, it costs us, Mr. Speaker, about one hundred millions. We were looking around for proper subjects for taxation. We knew that sugar would produce an enormous revenue; and besides all that, we knew that all adequate protective tariff would build up the industry in this country, and as it was gradually built up the revenue from that source will be reduced; by and by the revenue will come in more largely from other sources, and when this industry is fully established and revenue from sugar ceases the reduction will keep pace with the increase. The thing will regulate itself; we will not disturb our tariff in the next quarter of a century.

And Mr. Dingley said:

It should be borne in mind that the general increase of duty on sugar made in the proposed tariff has been made not only to increase the revenue, but also to further encourage the production of beet sugar in this country and furnish a new crop for our farmers, who are being sorely pressed as to our large wheat surplus by Russian and South American competition. I believe the time has come when the production of our own sugar from the beet ought to be and can be successfully entered upon, and thus the seventy-five millions sent abroad for the purchase of our sugar ultimately distributed here to our farmers. Already, indeed, it has been demonstrated that we can successfully produce beet sugar here, and the proposed duty placed on that article will gradually bring this about, while for the time being affording increased revenue.

Certainly nothing can be done to so successfully clip the wings of the sugar trust as to develop our beet-sugar industry. Sugar-beet factories turn out their product in a refined form, and thus become the efficient competitors of other refiners. The successful establishment of the sugar-beet industry in even half of the twenty-six States which can and will successfully grow sugar beets under the proposed tariff would speedily end any sugar trust, and would at the same time confer immense benefit on our farmers and all of our people.

It is quite clear in all of these declarations that the attempt of the Republican party to-day, under the management of the same leaders who managed the passage of the Dingley law in 1897, with the proposed cut of 20 per cent on Cuban sugar, the main competitor of the domestic sugar producers of this country is a violation of faith on the part of that party and its leaders with the domestic sugar producer. It is an unnecessary, unjust, and brutal violation of good faith. For, Mr. Chairman, if the Democratic party in its passage of the Wilson bill broke faith with the domestic sugar producer—and it was so declared by the Republican convention—then the Republican party to-day is breaking faith with the domestic sugar producer in attempting to foist

upon this country in behalf of a people whom they claim are to-day suffering, and whom the proof shows are not suffering at all, by fixing a tax less than the Wilson rate upon sugars coming into competition with domestic sugar.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have had occasion, some two years ago, in addressing sugar planters in Louisiana, to take the position that while the Republican party favored protection to all American industries, it also favored reciprocity; that the reciprocity which it favored, as contemplated by the Dingley law, was such an application of that policy as provides for reciprocal trade agreement with sugar as a basis; that the Republican party in carrying out the doctrine of reciprocity was to enter into such agreement only with sugar-producing nations and with sugar as a basis of such trade agreement.

In his speech a few days ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], in his effort to carry out his party's behest to break faith with the American sugar producer, catechised his Republican colleagues who, representing districts in the North and West, where sugar is produced, have been valiantly resisting the efforts of the Republican leaders on this floor to carry out this violation of faith; and I desire to call the especial attention of these gentlemen, whose courage, convictions, and manly conduct deserves the plaudits not only of their own constituency, but of the entire people throughout the United States—I desire to call their attention, and the attention of the country generally, to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] made only a few days ago on this subject. He said:

I remember the discussion growing out of that bill. For ten days we sat here in the Committee of the Whole and the bill was discussed. A great question arose; and, strangely enough, it was, among other things, the sugar tariff which caused the great interest therein. It was the purpose of the Republicans in that body to place sugar on the free list, and we had a sort of battle cry—I always thought it was more or less unworthy—of a "free breakfast table," and we shook our fists in the faces of the Democrats on the other side and demanded a "free breakfast table." So it was, however, that we placed sugar on the free list absolutely, making no tariff upon the raw sugar product of Cuba, but placing a bounty of 2 cents a pound upon the American product of sugar. At that time we were looking forward to the question of the production of beet sugar. We also provided for the free introduction into the United States of machinery for the manufacture of beet sugar. We had made arrangements for the free introduction into the United States of sugar-beet seed.

I cite this fact to show that the beet-sugar industry was then in case, if not in an assured condition of success. The great question as to the sugar schedule of that day grew out of the difference of opinion between Mr. Blaine, who had been for a long time an advocate of reciprocity, and William McKinley, who was at that early day also a disciple of Blaine reciprocity, but not committed to all the details of Blaine's position. It so happened that I myself heard in the State Department an almost acrimonious discussion between Mr. McKinley and Mr. Blaine upon this question, one side favoring a tariff on sugar, hides, etc., all put into the schedule, and then left competent for the President of the United States, in case of reciprocity, to take the tax off sugar. This was a question of law and administration, and both the great leaders to whom I have referred favored the use of sugar as a basis of reciprocal negotiation. Sugar was then an "infant industry," and yet these two great champions of protection favored reciprocity in this article.

There never has been an attempt to establish reciprocal trade with any great sugar-raising country that did not involve negotiation looking for the use of sugar as one of the articles to be affected.

The other great leaders of the party at the time took exactly the other view of it, and argued in favor of leaving the duty off or prescribing the amount that should be proclaimed by the President in case reciprocity should fail. And so it was that we ultimately placed sugar on the free list, providing that there was no adequate or sufficient or satisfactory reciprocity granted by the foreign States; then the President of the United States might put sugar coming from such country onto the tariff schedule at a rate of duty which we prescribed in the law.

Then we went forward, and reciprocity for the first time found an enduring place upon the statute books of the United States. And reciprocity at that early period of time numbered within the articles that were to be taken possession of and dealt with for reciprocal trade with foreign countries this same vexed article of sugar. Then came the Democratic tariff of 1894, the so-called Wilson bill, which grew out of the defeat of our party in 1890 and 1892, and in that law the Democratic party placed itself in utter hostility to the reciprocity conditions or propositions of the McKinley law and put the tariff on sugar, and we went forward through the disastrous period with which we are all familiar and about which I do not propose now to talk.

Then came the Dingley bill. Now, let me tell gentlemen who undertake to assault members of this House for lack of fidelity to the Dingley law that it would be well for them before they attempt to sow the seeds of discord in the Republican ranks in this country, before they attempt to aid the Democratic party of this country to secure a majority in the next House, it would be well for some politicians and statesmen to know something about what they are talking about. [Laughter.]

Everybody who had anything to do with making the Dingley law—and there are present in this House no less than seven or eight of the members who all that winter long following the election of McKinley in November, sat down day and night and Sundays in the Cochran Hotel and worked on the bill which was to be offered in the spring, and they will all remember that Mr. Dingley and the weight of opinion in that conference was against the high rate of duty that afterwards appeared in the law on raw and refined sugar. But at last, after a long contest, lasting all winter, and after the sugar trust had been heard, and after the beet-sugar men had come here in full force—intelligent men, far-sighted gentlemen—the Dingley bill was passed in the House, providing for a certain reduction upon raw sugar from Cuba and every other country that would enter into reciprocal relations with the people of the United States.

Again, speaking of the conference between the House and Senate on the Dingley bill, he says:

If we should cut down the duty upon refined sugar it would harm the beet-sugar interest, and if we should cut down the duty on raw sugar, then we should benefit it, it was said, the sugar trust, as it was called. So, at last, finding ourselves led by Dingley, so far as the House members of the conference were concerned, we voted to retain those provisions—to retain the

high duty upon sugar—with the distinct expectation, which every member of Congress had at that time, that sugar would be one of the prime articles that would be used in the interest of reciprocity.

And he concludes:

Now, I have shown conclusively, and I challenge contradiction, that sugar has been, in Republican estimation and in Republican enactment and in Republican discussion, understood to be a fit subject of reciprocity.

Thus it is seen, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] in this argument confirms the position that I occupied when addressing myself to the sugar producers of Louisiana, and it is well that our friends on the other side should fully appreciate the import of that position. This is said in no spirit of disparagement of the former conduct of the beet-sugar growers in the politics of the country, but it is well that a man engaged in a business predicated upon the good faith of party leaders should know exactly how such party leaders stand in reference to their pursuits, and should understand not merely what the declarations of the party may be, but what the practice of that party is, and it is to that that I shall direct the attention of the gentlemen at this time.

This argument possibly in no wise appeals to my colleagues on the Democratic side, but as I propose to show that under Democratic doctrine there is no room for reciprocity, they may be expected to stand aside while I demonstrate the correctness of my contention and the contention of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] that reciprocity as understood and as practiced by the Republican party is such a consummation as compels the domestic sugar producer to buy on a highly protected market everything that he uses and consumes, and to sell on a reciprocity market, which is only another word for a free-trade market, everything he produces.

I have shown by the utterances of one closely connected with tariff legislation what his conception of his party's utterances on reciprocity is. Now, I propose to show the acts of that party and to demonstrate that both he and I are correct—that is, the Republican party only favors such reciprocity as will tend to assist other protected manufactured goods in this country at the expense, under the doctrine of reciprocity, of the domestic sugar producer.

An investigation of the reciprocity treaties as enacted, both under the Dingley law and the McKinley law, confirms me in the opinion that this is so. I have here a list of all the treaties enacted.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. BROUSSARD. Certainly.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. The gentleman from Louisiana would not have the House understand that at that time we were producing any considerable amount of sugar?

Mr. BROUSSARD. No; we were producing about 250,000 tons of sugar, mainly in Louisiana. It is not pertinent to the discussion of this question whether the President, under the McKinley law, was authorized to impose a tariff on sugar and then destroy that tariff to secure reciprocal trade, but it is pertinent to demonstrate that the policy of the Republican party has been properly announced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] when he says that sugar has been the main basis of reciprocity under Republican doctrine.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. That was because it was an article of necessity and they could traffic in it. We did not produce that necessity.

Mr. BROUSSARD. The gentleman will allow me to say that we do not do it now. We may do it in the near future.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. We will do it.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I think we can do it. I am not saying this in criticism of the gentleman; I agree with him in the position he occupies. What I am saying is in line with the general argument of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], which I have been maintaining for three years in my district.

Now, an examination of the treaties negotiated under the McKinley and Dingley laws will demonstrate the correctness of the position. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCLELLAN] who has argued that reciprocity was Democratic doctrine, and who quoted extensively from Thomas Jefferson, to this fact: That, strange to say, arguing reciprocity was Democratic and quoting Jefferson in support of his position, he did not produce a single treaty, negotiated by Jefferson himself or by Jefferson's Administration while he was President of the United States, carrying out the doctrine that he announced here. The first treaty of reciprocity, barring one enacted in 1856, was the treaty of 1876, and that treaty was with Hawaii, enacted by a Republican administration, placing upon the American market Hawaiian sugar in free competition with the only sugar of the United States, that produced in Louisiana.

The reciprocity treaties enacted under section 3 of the act of 1890 was with Brazil in 1891; with Spain, not with reference to Spain itself but with reference, and it is so mentioned in the treaty, to Cuba and Porto Rico, both exporters of sugar. The

reciprocity treaty in 1891 with Santo Domingo, an island exporting sugar; with British Guiana; with Trinidad and Tobago and the Barbados; the Leeward Islands and the Windward Islands; with Jamaica; with Salvador in 1891, and Nicaragua and Guatemala and Honduras, all exporters of sugar, are all based on sugar as the primary article intended to be affected by the treaty. There was not one single treaty enacted under the McKinley law that was not predicated upon sugar as a basis of such treaty.

Now, it does not make much difference, in so far as this argument is concerned, that these things transpired then, because the producer was receiving his 2 cents bounty, or 1½ of a cent on sugar below certain tests, but it is significant, that both under the McKinley and the Dingley law, with few exceptions, all treaties that have been enacted, and most of the latter treaties remain unratified in the Senate to-day, are predicated upon a discrimination against the domestic sugar producer. Under the tariff act of 1897 there was a treaty with France; sugar is not a part of it, but I mention all of them that I may show that my position is not partisan and that I may argue from a broad standpoint. The treaty with France in 1896, with Germany in 1900, with Portugal and Italy are all ratified.

Now, as to the unratified treaties. Let us see how they read. There is a treaty with the United Kingdom, not for goods produced in England, but for goods produced in Jamaica, Coacas, and the Turks Island, and the Barbados, all producers of sugar; with Denmark, not with reference to goods produced in Denmark, but goods produced in the Danish West Indies, sugar-producing islands; with the Dominican Republic, a producer and exporter of sugar, Nicaragua and Ecuador and Argentina. They all show that the basis of the treaty was the reduction of the tariff on raw sugar, that the trust might obtain its sugar cheaper to compete with the American sugar producer. The reduction on sugar from Barbados and other islands is 12½ per cent. On Argentina it is 20 per cent, the full limit allowed by the Dingley law.

Now, these treaties show that while gentlemen on the other side argue, and I believe they argue conscientiously, that the doctrine of reciprocity, as understood by the Republican party, is a reciprocity that does not interfere with domestic producers, in fact and in practice the application of the doctrine has been peculiarly resting on sugar as a basis. Sugar has been the main prop of every reciprocity treaty enacted, both under the Dingley and under the McKinley laws. Gentlemen tell us that this bill provides for only 20 per cent reduction on sugar from Cuba; that it will not harm the American sugar producer.

Do you remember that they made the same argument in 1876? Look over the debates upon that question. Reciprocity with Hawaii was the theme then, and free sugar through Republican legislation was brought from there to this country under that treaty. Do you remember—I remember it because during every subsequent transaction of this character I have had the honor of a seat upon this floor—do you remember that when Hawaii was annexed to the United States gentlemen on the other side of the House and some on this side also said: "Well, Hawaii produces only a certain amount of sugar and can not interfere with the domestic sugar producer?"

Hawaii was annexed. What has been the result? She produced more the next year after annexation than all the domestic producers of sugar produced in this country. Do you remember that when the Porto Rico bill was pending here, and when it was proposed to reduce the tariff by cutting the Dingley rate to 25 per cent of the duty imposed by that act, gentlemen said: "It can not hurt us, because Porto Rico produces only 150,000 tons of sugar annually?" Yet what has been the result? To-day the sugar of Porto Rico comes into competition with that of our domestic producer; and Porto Rico has doubled her production since.

Do you remember that the other day when we had the Philippine bill before us, and it was proposed to cut the Dingley rate upon the products of the Philippine Islands coming into this country, gentlemen said: "They produce only a little sugar, and the importation can not hurt the domestic producer?" So the Philippines were packed on top of Hawaii and Porto Rico. And, now we come to the greatest cane-producing island of all the world; and gentlemen make the same argument that this island does not produce much sugar, and the importations from it can not affect the domestic sugar producer of this country. They have made this argument on all occasions and on every one of these propositions.

They have made it until they have piled up the production of Hawaii, and the production of Porto Rico, and the production of the Philippines; and now they propose to pile on the production of Cuba. And they say it can not hurt us because each of these, singly, does not produce very much sugar. Soon we may expect a repetition of the argument when this Republican Administration concludes the purchase of the Danish West Indies. The argument in each case is that the domestic producer can not be

harmful. Singly, possibly not, but collectively the certain destruction of the domestic industry must follow such policy.

Mr. Chairman, putting the entire production of these islands together, they can produce much more sugar than can be consumed in this country; nay, they can produce all the sugar to supply the consumption of the world. I am borne out in this statement by statistics collected by our Government, and the proposition will scarcely be controverted by any gentleman familiar with the subject.

Of course this is no argument to meet the position that some gentlemen occupy on this floor, but it does meet the argument of gentlemen on the other side who are now advocating a 20 per cent reduction of tariff on the Cuban product. It does meet their assumption that while they are urging this kind of "reciprocity" they are in favor of protection to all American industries. The kind of "reciprocity" which they favor affects only the domestic sugar producer. In other words, they want everything that is sold in this country, everything that the American sugar producer must buy and use in his home and in the manufacture of his sugar, sold on a protected basis; and yet, when it comes to his product, they want him to sell in a free market.

It is a matter of easy determination, susceptible of absolute proof, that the rate of tariff on sugar as fixed in the Dingley law, with the annexation by the Republican party of Hawaii and Porto Rico, whose sugars come free, and of the Philippines, whose tariff on sugar has been immensely reduced, and with the present proposition going into effect, is less than 40 per cent ad valorem, the duty fixed in the Wilson bill.

I do not think any gentleman will controvert that proposition. So that we are again brought to the forced conclusion that if the Democratic party broke faith with the domestic sugar producer, as declared by the Republican platform of 1896, the Republican party has not only broken faith with them but has rendered their position more precarious than it was during the existence of the Wilson law. For while then the tariff on sugar bore a just proportion to other tariffs, while then the domestic sugar producer received a small tariff on his product, he in turn had the privilege of buying every product which entered into his life, his home, and his business in a market where such product received the benefit merely of an equivalent tariff.

The domestic sugar producer might be said to be in the position that the smallness of the tariff on his product was balanced when he went on the market to buy what he needed by the small tariff on the products that he needed, used, and consumed. Under present conditions the domestic sugar producer finds himself in a position where he is compelled to buy on the highest protected market in the world everything that enters his household, his business, and his needs, and to dispose of his own product upon a market where the equal protection intended for him under the law has been broken down and destroyed, step by step, until he is forced into competition with the cheap product of other countries.

This fact is so palpable and so significant that I trust gentlemen on the other side and the people of the country generally will note the unjust and systematic discrimination that has been conducted by the Republican party against the domestic sugar producer North, South, and West.

The Republican party has said that protection and reciprocity go hand in hand. The President has said that reciprocity is the "handmaid" of protection. That may be true in theory, but unquestionably in practice it is not so. I say that reciprocity as applied to sugar is the "cat's-paw" of protection; for the domestic sugar producer sees a systematic movement on the part of the Republican party to use his industry to pull the nuts from the fire and to perpetuate the exorbitant tariff rates upon other manufactured goods in this country.

In other words, when the tariff rate is so high upon everything that a surplus grows in the Treasury to such an extent as requires the pruning out of this surplus the domestic sugar producer finds that in order to maintain the high rates on other industries and other manufactured goods the Republican party, with the cry of "reciprocity," forces him upon the altar of sacrifice. It is true that sugar is used to produce revenue when revenue is needed, but is also used to reduce revenue when more favored industries are involved.

And for one I never can see, in view of these facts, how any sugar producer can subscribe to the twin doctrines of the Republican party on this question. Rather would I trust to the doctrine of the Democratic party, which contemplates a tariff for revenue, for upon that basis the sugar producer can predicate the most truly just argument for a tariff; and a good tariff should be placed upon his product, for the reason that it is the article which produces most revenue, which gives the least protection, and which bears most universally and justly and equitably on all the people of the country, and therefore is the fairest of all the tariffs.

I have heretofore argued that no Republican should vote for

this measure, and I have heretofore stated that no Democrat can vote for it. I believe I have proved that no Republican should vote for it, and I shall now undertake to prove that this measure is not entitled to a single Democratic vote on this floor.

I shall predicate my first argument on this point upon the fact that this measure is purely a Republican measure, and a vote on the Democratic side in its support is a vote to further the interest of the Republican Administration, which position, in my mind, no Democrat should take unless there are very grave reasons why he should assist in carrying out an adverse Administration measure as a matter of essential interest to the entire country. That this is a Republican measure is palpable. The following excerpts from various reports recite a part of the history of this bill and its Republican paternity. I shall give them.

President McKinley, in his message to us of December 5, 1899, said:

This nation has assumed before the world a grave responsibility for the future good government of Cuba. We have accepted a trust, the fulfillment of which calls for the sternest integrity of purpose and the exercise of the highest wisdom. The new Cuba yet to arise from the ashes of the past must needs be bound to us by ties of singular intimacy and strength if its enduring welfare is to be assured. Whether those ties shall be organic or conventional, the destinies of Cuba are in some rightful form and manner irrevocably linked with our own, but how far and how is for the future to determine in the ripeness of events.

Major-General Wood, military governor of Cuba, in an authorized statement recently published, said:

On the other hand, unless action is taken, and taken promptly, on the question of tariff reduction, Cuba will be a monument, not to the good effects of our intervention, but to the ruin which has followed the destruction of her great industry.

The Secretary of War, in his annual report for 1901, said:

Our present duty to Cuba can be performed by the making of such reciprocal tariff arrangements with her as President McKinley urged in his last words to his country at Buffalo on the 5th of September. A reasonable reduction in our duties upon Cuban sugar and tobacco in exchange for fairly compensatory reductions of Cuban duties upon American products will answer the purpose, and I strongly urge that such an arrangement be promptly made.

And again:

Aside from the moral obligations to which we committed ourselves when we drove Spain out of Cuba, and aside from the ordinary considerations of commercial advantage involved in a reciprocity treaty, there are the weightiest reasons of American public policy pointing in the same direction; for the peace of Cuba is necessary to the peace of the United States; the health of Cuba is necessary to the health of the United States; the independence of Cuba is necessary to the safety of the United States. The same considerations that led to the war with Spain now require that a commercial arrangement be made under which Cuba can live. The condition of the sugar and tobacco industries of Cuba is already such that the earliest possible action by Congress upon this subject is desirable.

President Roosevelt, in his annual message to us last December, said:

Elsewhere I have discussed the question of reciprocity. In the case of Cuba, however, there are weighty reasons of morality and of natural interest why the policy should be held to have a peculiar application, and I most earnestly ask your attention to the wisdom, indeed to the vital need, of providing for a substantial reduction in the tariff duties on Cuban imports into the United States. Cuba has in her constitution affirmed what we desired—that she should stand in international matters in closer and more friendly relations with us than with any other power—and we are bound by every consideration of honor and expediency to pass commercial measures in the interest of her material well-being.

The idea involved in this bill saw its origin, you will recall, in General Brooke's report while governor-general of Cuba. It was upon General Brooke's recommendation that President McKinley predicated his recommendation of 1899. It was the recommendation of General Wood to the Republican Secretary of War, that the Republican Secretary of War recommended the matter to the Republican President. It was the Republican President that recommended this measure to the Republican Congress, and then you will recall the agitation of this matter after the President's message.

First, the Ways and Means Committee gave an extensive hearing to all parties at interest. It heard the supposed Cuban planter, the Cuban merchant, the Cuban banker, the sugar trust, the beet-sugar producer, the Louisiana cane-sugar producer, the Hawaiian and the Porto Rican planter; and then it was rumored after all of these interests had been heard, that there was not sufficient Republican votes on the Ways and Means Committee to bring the measure out of that committee. It was known that some Democrats on that committee favored the passage of this bill. Yet so anxious were the Republican leaders that they should have all the credit for this legislation that they were not willing to avail themselves of the votes of these Democrats in order to bring this bill to the consideration of the House. Then followed Republican caucuses.

In the first one, a majority of the Republicans seemed to be opposed to the measure, and then delay was asked by those who advocated the bill. The President took a hand in the matter, and one by one the recalcitrants were called to the White House, and then another caucus was held by the Republicans, with no better result than the first; then Governor Wood came on to Washington, and the sugar-trust agents flocked about the Capitol, and

another caucus resulted; and then a fourth, and then a fifth caucus, and it was not until the last caucus held by the Republican party on this subject that a majority of the Republicans could be secured to support this bill.

During all of this agitation the reasons for this measure were predicated upon the suffering of the people of Cuba, the relief of which was intended to be brought about through it. No effort was made to have this measure considered until it was certain that its Republican paternity was well established to all men of this great Republic.

You all recall that after this measure had been agreed upon, as a Republican measure in a Republican caucus, upon the recommendation of a Republican President and Republican officials, that the Committee on Rules debated long and seriously whether they should not force this bill through the House under the whip and spur of a rule limiting debate and limiting amendments. But to the credit of the Democrats and those Republicans who stand by the domestic sugar producer the rule was made impossible.

The Republican leaders knew full well that such a rule could not be put through the House against the wishes of the friends of the domestic sugar producer on the Republican side and the united forces of Democracy on the floor. So that, for the first time since I have been a member of Congress, this bill came into the Committee of the Whole House as a Republican measure without limit either as to debate or as to amendments, and yet there are gentlemen on this side of the Chamber who contend that this is a Democratic measure. I say to them that the history of the measure flies in the face of that contention. But that is not all of the history of the Republican paternity of this measure. Let me call your attention to the message of the President made to this Congress, and to the recommendations contained therein.

Apart from the recommendation of the passage of this bill by the President, 36 recommendations have been made to Congress. Of the 36 recommendations up to this moment only one of them has been pressed by this Republican Administration to a conclusion. That is the establishment of a permanent Census Bureau. Every other recommendation either lies dormant in divers committee rooms or is suspended between the House and the Senate.

In a desire to carry any of these recommendations has the President exercised the well-known pressure that he has exercised in this matter to bring about its culmination by the enactment into law of his recommendations? He has not summoned members of his party to the bar of his court to pass so important a measure as a law for the suppression of anarchy in this country, though he himself became President as a result of the fact that anarchy had robbed this Republic of the life of his lamented predecessor; he has not called to the bar of his court members of his party on this floor to press the passage of a law to supervise the trusts and suppress them in this country, though the American people are groaning under the exorbitant exactions of this commercial anarchy; he has not seen fit to call his leaders on this floor to demand that they create a new Cabinet officer, that the commerce and the industries may have a say and a vote in the council of his official family; no pressure to pass the eight-hour law for Government employees; no pressure to pass immigration laws demanded by organized labor in this country; no pressure to reduce the revenues which now increase the surplus in the Treasury daily, jeopardizing the commercial interests of our people; no pressure to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; no pressure for economy in Government expenditures; none for the protection of our forestry; none for the passage of irrigation laws for our brothers in the West; nothing to protect the public lands of Porto Rico; nothing to furnish the wherewith to construct the isthmian canal demanded by every section of the country and by every citizen of the Republic.

In fact, the whole power of this Administration has been devoted, in so far as it has the power to compel legislation in this body, for the one single purpose of passing this measure; and yet there are Democrats who stand on this floor and contend that this is a Democratic measure! For myself I can not understand that a Republican Administration should exercise all of its influence, bend all of its efforts, use all of its powers, to pass a measure that was not in keeping with the doctrines and the policy of its party, but intended to further the interest of the opposition party.

But gentlemen say that this bill is in keeping with tariff reform. I deny that. I deny it most emphatically, and the facts are so plain on that proposition that the wonder to me is how gentlemen can be so ingenious to present an argument on the other side of the question. Will this bill reduce the taxes of the people? I maintain, first, that genuine Democratic tariff reform must be upon the lines of giving cheaper goods to the American people. Is there any gentleman who contends on this floor that this measure will give to the American sugar consumer cheaper sugar than he is getting to-day? Not one.

The gentleman on the other side who made the first speech in behalf of this bill [Mr. PAYNE] said that it would not affect the

price of sugar to the consumer. The gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN] who, on this side, has led the fight in behalf of this bill has admitted that it would not reduce the price of sugar. Do gentlemen believe that we can make the people of this country think that by voting for a cut on the tariff that gives them no benefit at all—that such a measure is along the lines of genuine tariff reform? Do they believe they can go to their constituents and say, "I have cut 20 per cent on sugar," and expect the people of their districts to be so dull as not to understand when they go to the grocery store and have to pay the same price for sugar that they paid before the cut came, that there has been no genuine tariff reform effected by the passage of this bill.

As a tariff-reform measure, I contend that this bill is a myth, pure and simple. Genuine tariff reform does not consist exclusively in reducing rates, but it consists in reducing rates in such a way as to reduce the price of the article protected by the tariff. And that gentleman underestimates the intelligence of the American citizen when he believes that in the face of an admitted fact that a cut accomplished upon the tariff on a certain article will not reduce the price of it to the consumer, he is carrying out genuine tariff reform. In fact, the whole contention of the party pressing this measure is that there will be no reduction to the consumer.

Then the question resolves itself into this: Who is to get the advantage of this cut? Some one will benefit by it. Gentlemen on one side say the Cuban planter will get it. Gentlemen on the other side say the sugar trust will get it. But all agree that the consumer will not get the benefit of it. Which shall it be, will the Cuban planter get the benefit of the cut that you propose in this bill or will the sugar trust get it? I contend that the sugar trust will get the benefit of this 20 per cent reduction, and my reason for that can be stated in a few words.

The Cuban planter has but two markets wherein he may dispose of his sugar, the English market and the American market. The sugar trust is the only purchaser of raw sugar on the American market, and when the Cuban planter comes to dispose of his crop he has to accept one of two propositions, which I may explain in the following way:

The price of raw sugar is fixed at Hamburg. The price of raw sugar in England is the Hamburg price. The price of raw sugar in New York is the Hamburg price plus the transportation plus the tariff plus the differential. The Cuban planter has but the two markets within which he may dispose of his sugar. The English refiner says to him, "I will pay you the Hamburg price for your sugar delivered here." The American sugar trust says, "I will pay you the world's price for your sugar plus the tariff." The transportation from Cuba to England being higher than the transportation from Cuba to New York, the Cuban planter finds it advantageous to bring his sugar to New York and sell it to the sugar trust.

In that price the countervailing duty fixed by the law plays no part, and that was conceded by the gentleman from New York in his argument. Yet under all rules of commerce, if there was competition in purchasers for Cuban sugar on the New York market this countervailing duty properly belongs to the Cuban planter; but the sugar trust is in that position that it can withhold this countervailing duty from the Cuban planter, and does withhold it. If you reduce the tariff 20 per cent on Cuban sugar by the adoption of this measure you create a differential in favor of the Cuban planter, but as the trust has the power and does withhold the equivalent of the countervailing duty from the price paid the Cuban planter to-day, by the application of the same policy it can and will withhold this 20 per cent reduction of the present tariff rate on raw sugar, and the reason for that is obvious.

The Cuban planter is compelled to sell. He can not hold his crop; while the sugar trust is not compelled to buy the Cuban sugar. If the Cuban planter will not accept the offer of the trust, the trust can wait and the planter can not. It is true he has the alternative of taking his sugar to England, but there he comes in direct competition with German sugar. He now loses the advantage of the countervailing duty and will, after the passage of this act, lose the advantage of the 20 per cent reduction. He will lose still further, by taking his sugar to England, a difference in the cost of transportation between the rate from Cuba to New York and the rate from Cuba to England. Even after the trust insists upon appropriating this 20 per cent he will find it to his advantage to go to the New York market in preference to the English market, for in that way he will save the difference in the freight rates.

Now, will gentlemen contend that the trust, being the only purchaser, will not insist upon appropriating to itself this entire 20 per cent reduction if this bill passes? If without the assistance of legislation on the subject it now appropriates the countervailing duty, which of right belongs to the Cuban planter, with how much more reason will it appropriate the 20 per cent fixed by this act?

But we of Louisiana know by bitter experience that that will be the result of your legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BREAZEALE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time of my colleague be extended fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent that the time of his colleague be extended for fifteen minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. COCHRAN. With the understanding that the time of the other speakers will be correspondingly extended, I do not object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman does not object.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not object, but I think in fairness if that rule is adopted it should go down the line.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. The gentleman does not object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman does not object.

Mr. BROUSSARD. The price of sugar in New Orleans is predicated upon the New York price. Yet three-sixteenths of a cent a pound is taken off from that price because the sugar trust, the only purchaser we have, contends that the freight rate from New Orleans to New York is three-sixteenths of a cent a pound; and, singular to say, not a pound of that sugar goes to New York, but the trust has a refinery in New Orleans, and from there disposes of every pound that is produced in the State of Louisiana.

If they have the power to cut off three-sixteenths of a cent on every pound of sugar we produce, will any gentleman explain to me why, with the assistance of the Congress of the United States in passing this legislation, they will not be able to tell the Cuban planter, "We will pay you the New York price for your sugar plus the tariff that is charged, but as they have cut 20 per cent off the \$1.685 for 96 sugar, we demand that you surrender to us this 20 per cent of \$1.685 allowed you by your reciprocity treaty with the United States?"

Remember it is argued here that the Cuban planter is in a worse financial fix than the Louisiana planter. But the Louisiana planter can not wait. Will the Cuban planter, in a worse financial fix than his Louisiana brother, be able to wait? All are compelled to sell, and the sugar trust is not compelled to buy. If the trust falls short on the refined article it can turn to the overproduction of Germany and France and Austria-Hungary and get the sugar to supply the deficiency, and so the Louisiana planter is compelled to sell.

The Cuban planter, if he be worse off than the Louisiana planter financially to-day, will be compelled to deduct this 20 per cent granted by the American Congress and to take for his sugar, just as the Louisiana planter does, the price which the sugar trust is willing to give him, and the 20 per cent allowed by Congress alleged to be in behalf of the Cuban planter will go into the pockets of the sugar trust. The Cuban planter can not sell to anybody but the American sugar trust. So that this bill will really place in the pockets of this gigantic trust more than \$6,000,000 on the present sugar crop alone, which amount properly belongs to the United States Treasury.

If some gentleman can tell me to whom the Cuban planter can sell his sugar in this country except the sugar trust, I shall be glad to know it, and I can promise him that he will be looked upon as a prophet among my people, and, whether this bill passes or does not pass, he will become the prophet of the Cuban people as well.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Is the gentleman aware that there is a telegram from the president of the Sugar Growing Association of Louisiana stating that the planters down there are giving away their seed, that some are plowing up their stubble, and that the insurance companies are canceling policies on the sugar houses or raising the insurance rates 25 per cent within the last two or three weeks?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I am aware of that of my own knowledge, and I am glad the gentleman asked that question. My brothers and myself are interested in a sugar plantation in Louisiana, and this year we have taken the seed and rid ourselves of it, and we have plowed up the stubble field and planted the plantation in rice; not because we believed the sugar planter in Cuba would get the benefit of this 20 per cent, but because we knew that no matter who got this 20 per cent in so far as we are concerned the passage of this bill meant 20 per cent reduction on our sugars, for our only purchaser, the sugar trust, would say to us, "We now charge you a freight rate we do not have to pay, because if you will not sell to us at that rate in New Orleans you will have to pay the freight to New York and there sell to us, so now we tell you we will likewise deduct this 20 per cent, and your remedy is to move your sugar to New York and there sell to us in competition with the Cuban product, which we get 20 per cent cheaper since the reciprocity between Cuba and the United States."

I will say to the gentleman that a refinery in the town of Franklin, within 20 miles of my residence, the home of Senator Foster, that cost \$589,000, was sold the other day for \$47,000, with a view, it is reported, of tearing up the machinery and carrying it to Cuba. I am giving these facts which are within my own knowledge, and yet gentlemen tell us we are not being hurt in this country by this 20 per cent reduction.

In my own parish over 50 per cent of the production of last year has been cut down, and on the highways you may to-day find the seed cane intended to produce the wealth of that State. That is the way it is down there. But I am not appealing to gentlemen here to help us, to take us up. I am merely pleading for justice in behalf of an industry established in that State for over a hundred years, receiving the recognition of all parties—Democrats, Whigs, and Republicans—from 1789 to the present day. From the first tariff act, enacted on the 4th day of July, 1789, to this day there has been a tariff on sugar, not merely for its protection, gentlemen, but for the purpose of producing revenue for the Government.

And it is conceded that this 20 per cent reduction will not reduce the price of sugar to the consumer, but will cut the revenue of the Government \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 this year and twice as much next year if the production of sugar in Cuba increases in proportion as it has since the war has terminated on that island. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] the other day stated that the year after the war 800,000 tons of sugar were produced on that island, last year 600,000, and this year 900,000, and that next year, if we take the production of 1894 for comparison, the year that the people of Cuba were not at war with the people of Spain, it will produce over 1,000,000 tons of sugar if properly developed as it is ostensibly pretended that the bill here proposes to do.

But the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCLELLAN], after quoting Jefferson in support of the doctrine of reciprocity and feeling the weakness of his contention by his inability to show any treaty negotiated by Jefferson, either when a Cabinet officer or as President of the United States, undertakes to prove that reciprocity is Democratic on the ground that it tends to cut the rate of tariff fixed by the law, and in that contention he is ably supported by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. I contend that the argument is false, and the reason of its falsity is apparent. Under Democratic doctrine it is contended that only such tariff can be imposed as will produce sufficient revenue to economically administer the Government. If a cut of the tariff is brought about by reciprocity, one of two things must result. Either a deficiency in the Treasury proportionate with the cut and in keeping with the articles brought into this country under that treaty, or a raise of tariff on articles coming from other countries.

Reciprocity is essentially predicated upon the doctrine that the tariff collected in the custom-houses exceed the needs of the Government economically administered, for if there is no surplus in the Treasury there can be no cut without the danger of deficiency, and the consequent bankruptcy of the Government. If there is a surplus justifying a cut the Democratic remedy is not in the maintenance of a high tariff and the cutting off of a portion of it by reciprocity treaties, but the Democratic remedy is the reduction of the tariff along all of the lines and in behalf of all of the countries trading with this country.

Can a gentleman answer this argument? And just so as the proposed legislation is only considered because there is a surplus in the Treasury now, and the Republicans propose to reduce that revenue by this false system of tariff reform, giving the advantage of one country over all others in amity with the United States and crippling one American industry to give unjust advantages to others, just so when this doctrine is reciprocated by the Cuban Republic in order to carry out the condition imposed upon her by this measure will it be compelled to enact a tariff law which will produce more revenues than necessary to economically administer the government of that Republic or adopt the protective tariff system.

For, just in proportion as we derive advantage from this reciprocity treaty, in that exact ratio will the duties on goods coming from other countries into Cuba bear the burden of the concession to us. Is that not a fact? The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] says that the gentlemen on the Republican side who are supporting this bill are infused with 20 per cent of Democracy. I deny that; but, if it be true, does not the gentleman himself propose to carry the Republican doctrine of a tariff in excess of the needs in revenue of the Government somewhere else, and no less volens to impose upon a free Republic compulsory Republican tariff legislation?

Admitting that Republicans advocating this measure are infused with 20 per cent of Democracy, they still remain believers in a protective tariff to the extent of 80 per cent. So that while the gentleman is not improving conditions here on the lines of Democratic tariff reform, as contended for by him, he is compelling

the people of Cuba to adopt the same system in Cuba that he complains of as robbery in this country. It is a most singular way of propagating one's faith in Democratic doctrine to so shape events that at one fell swoop he compels every Cuban elected to the Cuban congress and the Cuban president to become Republicans in fact, whether they believe in the doctrines of the Republican party or not. He can not get away from this proposition. I contend that if he wants the Democratic plan of tariff in this country he ought to be willing to apply it to Cuba. What is good for the American Republic ought to be good for the sister republic.

If 20 per cent is added to the necessary tariff to economically administer the Government of this country, the gentleman calls it robbery. If it is robbery here, it is robbery in Cuba. This difference exists, however, between the robbery here and the robbery there, and that is, that this country is self-imposed and voluntary, the power of taxation being in the hands of the representatives of the people on this floor; but in Cuba, if this measure is carried out, the robbery will be compulsory, because, in order to get this treaty enacted, 20 per cent will have to be added to whatever tariff rate is necessary to produce the revenue to carry on the Government of Cuba economically administered.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That is highway robbery over there and petty larceny here. [Laughter.]

Mr. BROUSSARD. I accept the amendment. [Laughter.] Now, I say that under Democratic rule, under Democratic tariff enactment, there is no room for reciprocity—none whatever. There can be none. Because the very moment you admit that the tariff rate is too high, then the duty of the Democrat is not to enact reciprocity treaties, but to reduce the rate so that a surplus shall not accumulate in the Treasury. [Loud applause.]

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, if it were clear that the people of the United States were to get the benefit of this reduction, or if it were clear that the people of Cuba were to get the benefit of this reduction, there might be some excuse for Democrats on this floor joining the Republicans in their political policy and in this administrative measure. And yet, if that were so, as I understand the Democratic policy of tariff, that would hardly be excusable. I know there was a time when the Democrats, or that branch of the Democratic party called the Cleveland Democrats, contended that in this country we should have free raw materials and a tariff on the finished product in order to encourage manufactures in the United States. That doctrine struck the country Democrats with such an unfavorable impression of its innate wrong that that proposition was fought out in our conventions and in this Hall. Republicans were so unkind as to charge that President Cleveland advocated free raw material because he and his friends owned some great Nova Scotia coal fields and wished to get the product into the United States free of duty. Democrats, generally from the body of the country, contended that free raw material was not a Democratic doctrine, as in such cases the benefits of the tariff, if any, went into the pockets of the already highly protected manufacturers, and did not necessarily reduce the price to the consumer. Mr. Cleveland's policy was repudiated by the Democratic party.

I very well remember that our brilliant leader, Mr. BAILEY, stated most clearly upon this floor that the Democratic doctrine is that if there is any benefit in the distribution of the revenue tariff to industries in this country, then every farmer, every producer of the so-called raw material is entitled to his share of the protection; that if it is a burden, he is entitled to bear his proportion of the burden. Now, what is it that we are dividing upon on this side of the House? If the question is, Shall we take the tariff off the raw material imported from a foreign country, made by foreign labor, and leave the tariff on the finished product, and bring it over for the protection of the already unreasonably protected manufacturers of this country, then certainly that is not Democratic. You will bear in mind that we already have a differential duty in this country in favor of the sugar refiners that the Democrats have been fighting for years. We have got a low tariff now made at the dictation of the sugar trust on the raw material, simply that the trust may refine sugar at a profit, and leave the much higher tariff on the finished product, so that the American people may not have reduction on the sugar they consume.

Our friends, it seems to me, have made the most serious mistake that I have seen the great party make since I have been in this House. We found yesterday our friend from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], standing here with a bland smile on his face, looking the Republicans on the other side of the aisle in the eye and saying, "My Republican friends, you are gulping down a dose of 20 per cent of Democracy." Did not the gentleman see at the same time that he was gulping down 80 per cent of Republicanism? He was insisting on taking a tariff off a field product for a manufacturer, and insisting in the same bill that we should fetter the

people of Cuba with an American statute that made them mendicants to our Government. The gentleman will please excuse us from the West if we contend that it is not Democratic to take the tariff off the raw sugar the farmer grows and leave the much higher tariff on the refined product that he consumes, making it impossible to get cheaper sugar. He must pardon us if we repudiate this new tariff departure which takes the tariff off of what we produce and sell and leaves the high tariff on everything we buy, even to the refined sugar made from our beets. He will be patient with us if we balk at casting a vote in this case as invited by the sugar barons and the Republican organization under the false assumption that this is Democratic doctrine. Nothing is Democratic that makes the chairman of the national Republican committee, Mr. HANNA, chuckle, as he did when you joined him cheek by jowl in obeying the dictates of the sugar trust and closed our mouths in the coming campaign as to this infamy.

The gentlemen further contend that they are voting for this simply because it reduces the tariff. I want to say to our friends if, as Democrats, their only object in reducing the tariff is to lower the figures in the schedule without reducing the price to our consumers—if it has no more substance than that, then for heaven's sake let the figures stand where they are and do not attempt to deceive the people. This is a mere will-o'-the-wisp, a rainbow chase after gaudy shadows; but it reacts on the farmers of the West by intimidating those seeking to develop sugar beets.

We are told by the leaders on both sides that there is to be no reduction to the consumer in the United States. It seems to me that would be sufficient to prevent any Democrat from walking over and joining hands in forcing the passage of the political policies of the Republican party. I ask our friends, Why have a Democratic party? What is the use of having a Democratic party if, when the Administration brings forth its political policy, we are to go at breakneck pace and join them and pass those political policies? It is admitted that this bill, if passed, will take \$6,000,000 in revenue from our Treasury; that a large part of it will go into the hands of the sugar trust, to be distributed as it sees fit. If this bill passes, Democrats are responsible for it. If the two parties only differ in little formal measures, then why keep up two organizations?

I want to say to you that it should have been sufficient when the astute General DICK, in the Republican caucus, said: "My fellow Republicans, pass this bill and you will see strung out in front of every Democratic campaign committee on the next election, 'Gentlemen, here is your tariff for the trusts, and there is your free trade for the farmer.'" This epigram from this sagacious politician states the whole case. You take the tariff from a field product and hand it over to a sugar trust, without touching the tariff on refined sugar, in which the consumer is interested. Colonel DICK overestimated this side of the House. He thought the Democratic party would be eager and anxious to take advantage of the opportunity and say to the country that we are anxious to reduce the tariff on refined sugar; we are eager to reduce the tariff on the sugar that goes to the consumer, but, by the gods, we will make no further reduction on raw sugar, the price of which goes into the pockets of the American Sugar Refining Company. But he had forgotten Grant's prophecy of our party. You are taking the raw material that has a differential already estimated, under the manipulations, at nearly 40 per cent less than the refined product, put on the sugar schedule at the dictation of the American sugar trust, for the sole use and benefit of the sugar trust.

One might well think from the eagerness with which Democratic leaders vie with Republican leaders in serving this trust that in the future it will be perfectly safe whichever party is in power, and the trust may be relieved of an enormous contribution to the Republican campaign fund. Why pay when help is so willing? The fact that the floor leaders of both parties are trying to give the American Sugar Refining Company a greater differential on raw sugar, without disturbing the much higher rate on refined sugar, has encouraged other manufacturing trusts. A few moments ago you witnessed the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] devoting all of his speech in favor of removing the duty from hides, leaving a high tariff on leather for the leather trust and shoemakers of his State. He can see no reason why the sugar trust should be given freer raw material without giving also the leather trust freer raw material.

I wish to sound the warning here and now that there is and will be no Democrats from the great West who will subscribe to the new doctrine of the amalgamated leaders of the parties, "Protection for the fostered manufacturers and free trade for the farmer and producer of raw material." As long as we are forced to pay a high tariff on everything we buy we shall contend for a like rate on what we have to sell. When the day of reduction is at hand, we shall gracefully submit to the general cut.

I suppose that those members who do not come from sugar-

producing States may keep their people in ignorance of the true significance of this proposition. But I want to say to you that there are 20 States and Territories in this Union that are growing sugar beets. This is a farm product; and those men who love the memory of Jefferson so much, who sing the song of Jefferson's principles year in and year out, seem to forget for the moment what was an ideal of his life. He even doubted whether he wanted ever to have a great manufacturing center. He said, "While we can keep our people in the country, we can keep them patriotic, we can keep them honest, we can keep them true; but if we have to pile them up on top of one another in great cities, corruption will come, government will deteriorate, and then trouble will follow." He never expected any of his followers would ever be dragging tariff from the raw material of a field product and shoving it down into the pockets of protected manufacturers. He expected the followers of Hamilton to do this.

Now, my friends, in 1867, when William D. Kelley, known as "Pig Iron Kelley," stood on the platform in Milwaukee talking of the great industries of this country, he said: "Gentlemen, I want to make a forecast now, that before a half century passes away the great Northwest will be growing sugar for the State of Louisiana." The people who heard him laughed at him. But, sir, he knew this country as a child knows his alphabet. He said: "From here to the high elevations of the Rocky Mountains you can grow the sugar beet as successfully as they can in Germany, as they can in France, as they can in any country of Europe." Professor Tassig confirmed his opinion of the possibilities of our soil and climate, but said it would be deferred till our lands were divided and every man would not have an abundance of land over which to ride machines. That time is now here.

Now, my friends, we have just got started; we were surprising the world when this monster stepped in here and checked our progress; we have succeeded in getting into the office of the Secretary of Agriculture a real farmer who is with us heart and soul; we have succeeded in getting a man there who puts forth his every effort to grow in this country what we consume here. He said: "Give me ten years, and I shall keep at home the \$100,000,000 now going out of this country for sugar." He sent his experts to every part of the country trying to disseminate the production of rice in the South, of tea in South Carolina, and of sugar in the Northwest. And what does it mean? In my district last year we produced nearly 20,000 tons of refined sugar. Two years prior we did not produce a pound. In the State there are now building three new plants, costing nearly a million dollars each. The Agricultural Department has just reported that arrangements are being consummated in Colorado to build seven more plants this year and throughout the United States that \$49,000,000 is raised for the purpose of developing this beet industry in the United States. Last year the sugar production from beets in the United States increased 140 per cent over the year before. I here append a report of Mr. Saylor, expert of the Government, as to the present status and the future prospect of the industry, viz:

[The Washington Post.]

THE MAKING OF BEET SUGAR—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE EXPERT
MAKES REPORT ON THE INDUSTRY.

C. F. Saylor, the special agent in charge of the beet-sugar investigations of the Department of Agriculture, is in Washington making his annual report. He made public yesterday the following figures regarding the industry during the past year:

The total production of beet sugar in the United States in the season 1901-2 has aggregated 185,000 tons, an increase of 140 per cent from the 77,000 tons produced during the season of 1900-1901. There were 31 factories in operation in 1900, according to the census figures, and 11 more were started in 1901. There are 9 factories in course of construction for operation in 1902, as follows: Sebawaing, Carrollton, Mount Clements, and Crosswell, Mich.; Shelby, Ind.; Greely, Eaton, and Fort Collins, Colo.; and Phoenix, Ariz., ranging in capacity of daily output from 500 tons to 1,000, the latter figure being the capacity at the Phoenix plant.

Other companies have been organized with a total capitalization of \$49,000,000, and would require annually a working capital in addition of \$9,080,000. According to Special Agent Saylor they would purchase from the farmer annually beets to the amount of \$14,700,000, besides many other crude materials. The number and aggregate capital of these prospective plants, by States, follow:

Arizona 2, \$1,500,000; California 5, \$3,500,000; Colorado 7, \$5,000,000; Indiana 1, \$1,000,000; Iowa 6, \$3,100,000; Idaho 1, \$500,000; Michigan 28, \$14,900,000; Minnesota 5, \$2,400,000; Montana 1, \$500,000; New York 2, \$1,500,000; New Jersey 1, \$500,000; North Dakota 2, \$1,000,000; Ohio 3, \$1,250,000; Oregon 1, \$500,000; Pennsylvania 1, \$500,000; South Dakota 2, \$1,000,000; Utah 3, \$2,500,000; Wisconsin 10, \$3,150,000; Wyoming 2, \$1,500,000.

Now, our friends ask whether we appeal to the balance of the country for the protection of our special industry. I say yes, if we can do it without injury to them. In France not only was this industry protected but the Government itself grew beets, whatever the price, until the industry got on its feet. The German Empire has nursed the industry until thoroughly developed.

But we have not asked you in this case to protect us; and I shall say here and now that if we could be guaranteed to-morrow that this 20 per cent cut would be the last, that the reduction would cease at this point, and if capital should understand this fact we in Colorado would not care the snap of our fingers for

the "cut." It is the intimidation of capital and the fear of the future that retards our progress. The growers will say if this trust can drive you to a reduction of 20 per cent on raw sugar for the trust alone, it will continue to drive you. But I want to say that you are now destroying this industry just as rapidly as possible without benefiting anybody materially except the sugar trust, which refines the raw sugar.

Let us get this clearly before the American people. There is a very high tariff on refined sugar to keep the European product up, ostensibly for the benefit of the home sugar growers and for revenue purposes. Through the influence of the American Sugar Refining Company a much less tariff is placed on raw sugar to induce the shipping here for refining. This American Sugar Refinery is practically the only purchaser of raw sugar. It pays immense salaries and very large dividends on much watered stock. It now demands, ostensibly in the interest of Cuba, an additional reduction of 20 per cent on raw sugar from Cuba. This will take \$6,000,000 from the revenue of this Government on the present stock. The whole benefit will go into the hands of the American sugar refineries, the only purchasers. What are they going to do with it? They say distribute it among the sugar planters of Cuba. Who are the great sugar growers of Cuba? The members of the American sugar refineries, and therefore we take \$6,000,000 from our Treasury and give to the American sugar refineries to distribute largely among their members as sugar growers of Cuba. And yet we are told that such pilfering is Democratic. I deny it. I denounce it.

The new paper men follow these things up pretty closely, and they have kept track of the influence of every act of this body, and what it has done. Every act that you have done in this body or at the other end of the Capitol has depressed the sugar beet. It has not reduced the price of refined sugar; but every act in the direction that this bill points has made the stock of the sugar trust jump by millions. Why is this so? Why is it if the sugar trust is to get no benefit that with every move made here in the direction of the pending legislation the sugar-trust stock jumps upward and forward?

This legislation is in the interest of the sugar trust alone, just as the legislation for reciprocity with Hawaii was. It seems to me this consideration ought to be sufficient for the Democrats in this House. At the dictation of the sugar barons of Hawaii and others we in this House gave "reciprocal relations" until Hawaii took out of our Treasury \$98,000,000 before being admitted into the Union.

Operation of the treaty between the Hawaiian Islands and the United States, under which their sugar was admitted free of duty.

Year.	Imports of sugar from Hawaiian Islands.	Tariff rate per ton.	Amount of duty remitted.	Exports (value of) to Hawaiian Islands.
	Tons.			
1876	10,000	\$63.00	\$630,000	\$1,109,429
1877	14,000	63.00	882,000	1,683,446
1878	17,135	63.00	1,079,505	2,288,178
1879	20,532	63.00	1,293,516	1,955,506
1880	28,384	63.00	1,788,192	2,694,583
1881	40,555	63.00	2,554,965	3,272,172
1882	50,905	63.00	3,207,015	3,683,490
1883	50,873	44.80	2,279,110	3,445,024
1884	63,601	44.80	2,849,325	2,709,573
1885	76,394	44.80	3,422,451	3,115,899
1886	85,546	44.80	3,822,461	3,520,593
1887	95,000	44.80	4,256,000	3,025,858
1888	99,547	44.80	4,459,705	3,333,040
1889	112,707	44.80	5,049,274	4,005,900
1890	109,686	44.80	4,913,933	4,935,911
1891	129,475	Free.		3,662,018
1892	114,259	Free.		2,717,398
1893	136,689	Free.		3,217,713
1894	133,585	20.00	2,671,700	3,648,472
1895	201,631	18.00	3,629,358	3,923,187
1896	224,218	21.00	4,708,578	4,622,581
1897	204,814	37.00	7,578,118	5,773,672
1898	252,506	37.00	9,342,722	9,006,071
1899	253,561	37.00	9,506,757	13,077,506
1900	236,000	37.00	10,932,000	13,000,000
	2,826,603		90,946,686	108,087,770
* Deduct the exports for the years 1891 to 1893, during which period there was no duty on sugar				9,597,069
Total				98,470,701

^b Estimated.

It is true that the people who received the benefit of this are said to have put from a half a million to a million annually into the Republican campaign fund. But I do not see that that is any reason why Democrats should jump to the rescue of this great trust. If you continue you will discourage the trust from contributing to Republican campaign funds. You will do their work gratis.

Now, let us see what effect the action on this bill has had. Here is Mr. Sherman G. Palmer's résumé, January 15, 1903:

WAR OF THE SUGAR TRUST.

[Press comment compiled by Truman G. Palmer, Washington, 1902.]

Chronology of 1901-2 events.

Benefits to Cuba if bill passes.....	0
Benefit to sugar trust.....	\$6,000,000
Loss to United States revenues.....	6,000,000

American sugar industry.
STARTING POINT.

Valuation of sugar trust refineries.....	\$30,000,000
Capitalization of sugar trust.....	75,000,000
First event.—Sugar trust increases its capital stock to \$90,000,000.	
Second event.—Sugar trust starts war of prices against Pacific coast beet-sugar producers by cutting prices one and a half.	
Third event.—Sugar trust starts war of prices in the Missouri Valley against the Colorado, Nebraska, and Utah beet-sugar producers.	
Fourth event.—Sugar trust's literary bureau starts to working up popular sentiment favoring tariff reduction on Cuban sugar, of which it is the sole purchaser.	
Fifth event.—Sugar trust packs the "reciprocity convention" and the beet-sugar producers bolt it.	
Sixth event.—First week in January, 1902, sugar-trust stock sells at \$116; common, \$115 preferred, making value of total issue \$104,062,500.	
Seventh event.—January 15, 1902, Committee on Ways and Means commence hearing testimony concerning "Cuban relief."	
Eighth event.—March 15, sugar-trust stock sells at \$126; common, \$117; preferred; value of total issue, \$109,575,000; net increase in value, \$5,512,500.	
Ninth event.—March 18, majority of House Republicans on Committee on Ways and Means adopt bill favoring 20 per cent tariff reduction on Cuban sugars and other products.	
Tenth event.—March 22, sugar-trust stock sells at \$133; common, \$119; preferred; value of total issue, \$113,737,500; net increase since ninth event, \$4,162,500, and since the sixth event, \$9,675,000.	

Now, that comes pretty near telling the story. Who is getting this benefit? It is the sugar trust and the sugar trust alone that is getting the bulk of it. I want to suggest to our friends another thing. You are not doing a thing for the American consumers. You are not doing a beneficial act to the Cuban people. The good you are doing is to the sugar trust and the great planters of Cuba. Now, I want to suggest to our Democratic friends who run forward to grasp a Republican measure and strike down our industries to see what the Democratic papers of the great West think of it. We are not very large out there, but according to the report of the Agricultural Department this industry is now established in 20 States and Territories, and Colorado, our State, ranks in production this year next to Michigan. Now, let us see what your conduct here has done. We are now building four sugar factories. Here is a dispatch to the Rocky Mountain News, the leading Democratic paper west of the river, on April 7, which I would like every Democrat to consider, it being dated at Fort Collins, where they are building one of these big plants:

For some months past experts in the employ of the Havemeyers have been quietly making a thorough and systematic investigation of the Colorado fields. They report that the Colorado soil and climate was the best in the world for sugar beets and that independent companies were starting factories all over the State.

Now, our factories, some of them, are owned by the Oxnards. The others are owned by local and outside independent capital. I believe we have got eight now about ready to run, and it costs about \$1,000,000 to build a factory with a capacity of 1,000 tons a day and half a million to build one with a capacity of 500 tons a day. Continuing, the dispatch says:

The Havemeyers were afraid that a few years might develop very dangerous competition, and decided that in order to protect themselves they must own the Colorado factories. They have already completed arrangements for controlling interest in the Eaton. The Greely Company at first refused to sell. The Havemeyers said that if the Greely people absolutely refused to sell, then Greely would have two factories. Negotiations are now in progress for a factory at Loveland. The owners of Loveland factory want to sell for one million. The Havemeyers have submitted a proposition to add one million, making a two-million plant, arranged for 5,000 acres of beets, and to allow the home people to maintain their stock, the only condition being that the Havemeyers should control and sell the product.

It goes on further and states that in the evening they unanimously decided they would have to sell. Then he went further to the Loveland plant and gave them their option to sell or fight. Now, here is the editorial of the News that came this morning:

COLORADO, Sunday, April 13.

The raid of the sugar trust on the independent sugar factories in this State was made possible only by the announcement by the National Administration favoring a reduction in the tariff on raw cane sugar anywhere from 20 per cent to 50 per cent of the present impost. When President Roosevelt declared himself in favor of that reduction, the independent beet-sugar makers felt that the power of the Administration would be used to make it a fact, and the additional reductions on the plea of helping Cuba or an annexation of the island and the consequent admission of sugar free of duty might be dreaded as a possibility in the future. With the club in their hands, the agents of the trust came to Colorado, beat the people of Fort Collins into submission, and now are trying to bulldoze the people of Eaton and Greely and the owners of Loveland out of their factories.

Does the Democratic party want to become a handmaid of Havemeyer's? Whether you desire these acts or not, you are directly encouraging them. You are aiding and abetting the sugar trust in its onslaught on the infant beet industry without a promise or prospect of a single benefit to your people. We feel the heavy hand of the Democrats because it is by their act that our

industries are stifled. We complain of them because they are doing the unnatural, the unheard of, undemocratic act of going to the rescue of the Republicans after they have failed to carry their Administration and purely political measure.

Continuing, the News says:

The purpose of the trust is to get control of all independent beet-sugar factories, so as to kill organized opposition to further reduction of the duty on all cane sugar, and so as to stop the growth of the industry in this State, even though the tariff be not reduced more than 20 per cent.

Now, gentlemen, that has taken place in the last two weeks. It has taken place because the sugar trust, encouraged as it has been both by Democrats and Republicans on this floor, has no doubt of its power to reduce this tariff further and to get raw sugar into this country practically free of duty. Now, it seems to me that our organization on this side of the House, if we had been careful, if we had come together and figured with one another, if we had conferred in time before we joined the Republican party, that so many of you would not have committed such mistakes as we are committing.

Colorado repudiates the doctrine of "a high tariff for everything the great manufacturer sells and a very little or no tariff on the raw material that it buys, and a very high tariff on all the farmers buy and a very low tariff or none upon what the farmers produce or sell," under the pretense of free raw material. We object to having raw sugar selected for a reduction of the tariff, while continuing the present high tariff on all things that the sugar producer buys. Equality is equity in revising the tariff as well as elsewhere. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is recognized for twenty minutes.

[Mr. COCHRAN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. WARNOCK having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. CROOK, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

On April 15, 1902:

H. R. 3084. An act for the relief of bona fide settlers in forest reserves:

H. R. 11409. An act to authorize the construction of a traffic bridge across the Savannah River from the mainland within the corporate limits of the city of Savannah to Hutchinsons Island, in the county of Chatham, State of Georgia:

H. R. 184. An act to establish and provide for a clerk for the circuit and district courts of the United States, held at Wilmington, N. C.; and

H. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to issue certain temporary permits.

RECIPROCITY WITH CUBA.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY C. SMITH] is recognized for thirty minutes.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I am not persuaded that this bill is of value to this country or that it will be of aid or assistance to Cuba. The general scope of this bill, in substance and in effect, is that if Cuba will pass certain laws granting to the United States an advantage in the reduction of the tariff rates on the products of the United States passing into Cuba, and will by its legislative power enact immigration and exclusion laws of the same force and effect as those of the United States, and will establish an independent government, and will maintain that government and maintain those tariff schedules and maintain the labor laws and the exclusion laws, that then, in consideration of this conduct on the part of Cuba, the United States will reduce its tariff rates on the things raised in Cuba coming to the United States 20 per cent.

In other words, if Cuba will do these things that the United States requires, then the United States will give her 20 per cent advantage over the other countries of the world. And for how long? For the briefest of periods. The act provides that it shall not in any case extend beyond the 1st day of December, 1903. And we are asked to do this for humanity's sake. And the claims of Cuba upon us are so strong, so says the committee, that we are urged to pass this law even before Cuba has a government, anticipating before, in the law, there is any Cuba.

In fact, there is serious doubt in the minds of many whether such a law would be valid. The sovereign power in Cuba to-day rests in the United States. When the Spanish flag went down, the Stars and Stripes went up. When Spanish power went out, the power and authority of the United States came in. This is the law of nations, the law of the world. And the sovereignty

will remain in the United States until the United States parts with that sovereignty.

Now, just contemplate for a minute Cuba, an independent nation, buying her independence, the very first step in her life as an independent nation, surrendering her independence and submitting to permit the United States to dictate the laws she shall make. Now, if it should turn out that this bill, in any form, shall pass this body, and shall pass the Senate, and shall go down to Cuba, I apprehend, as I read the history of that brave and courageous people, that we may anticipate fairly that these men who have made such a gallant fight for all these years against the tyranny of Spain will hesitate and debate some and discuss at some length before that little Republic shall consent that the great United States shall dictate to it the kind of laws that it shall execute—the kind of laws under which it shall live and thrive.

And if it does discuss this proposition, and there is as much contention and as much want of harmony among the people of Cuba upon the question as to whether it is of any benefit to them or not, whether it is a proper law for them to enact, whether they will reap any benefit from it, whether they want to go into that kind of thing or not, then it will be six months or a year before they will be in a condition to enact our exclusion laws—to enact laws similar to ours with reference to people coming to the island—and upon those other propositions under the labor laws; and after all that is done and certified by the proper authorities to the President of the United States, and the President of the United States has become satisfied that they have a stable, independent government, that they have enacted labor laws of equal force as our own, that they have entered into an agreement whereby they will grant trade concessions to us equivalent to ours, then the President of the United States is to make a proclamation, and from that time on they are to have the benefit of this wonderful boon and favor. And what is it if it is ever done?

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] demonstrated here as clearly as it can be proven, it seems to me, that the planters away down in Cuba, after waiting all this year, may receive from the United States the munificent sum of \$66 each. What do they give us, gentlemen, in return for what we give to them? If they get the whole of it, as Mr. STEVENS showed, what do they give to us? Here is a nation struggling for all these years against Spain, and it has at last obtained its independence. Now the first step in that independence of that bright young republic is to surrender her independence, as I have suggested, and to say that we who have been patriots, and who have been fighting as never people fought before, will allow the great United States to dictate to us the manner of laws we shall have, and how we shall live. And what excuse is there for it? Why, the excuse for it, as set forth by the chairman of this great committee, is that if Cuba shall be permitted to have laboring men go into her country that they will flock there from all corners of the earth, and they will engage in the business of raising cane and producing sugar, and they will flood the markets of the United States, and they will destroy the sugar-beet industry and the cane-sugar industry in the United States. In other words, they are required to enact our exclusion laws for the purpose of preventing them from growing and adding one to the number of their population. Why, think of it!

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] said we were setting the little republic up in housekeeping; just starting her up; and he smiled like a lover in his benevolence at starting this little republic up in housekeeping. I do not want him to be my guardian; I do not want him to be my guardian in housekeeping and to say just who I shall have come and visit me, just whom I shall get to make up my household, and just who shall go into the housekeeping business with me or who shall come in there. We say to Cuba, If you will conduct your affairs as we dictate, we will do business with you; if you will buy certain things we have to sell, we will do something for you to relieve your distress; if you will buy the trust-made steel, the trust beef, the trust glass, paints, and oils, and all the other things we want you to buy of us. And if you will not do this, then you can go your way. The effect of this bill is that Cuba can suffer, can go into bankruptcy, and can starve and suffer on until she will come to our terms. Why, if Cuba shall submit to any such terms as this, I am sorry, for one, that all the blood and treasure of the United States was ever used to liberate such a people. I have too high a regard for that brave young republic to believe that they will permit us to dictate the kind of laws they shall make, and dictate to them and say, "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther. You can accept our bounty; we will give you 20 per cent reduction if you will agree to add not one number to your population, if you will agree to add nothing to your sugar business and other concerns."

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. In restraint of trade.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Yes; in restraint of trade and in restraint of humanity and everything. The chairman of this

committee said that we were the guardian of this republic. "We rescued your property. When we came to you we found it in the hands of the worst tyrant the world ever knew, and we rescued it from the tyrant and we turned it over to you. We settled accounts. Now, after we have given you your property, you may go, but if you do not follow the policies that we dictate, the policies that we point out, you may go your way, and we will have nothing more to do with you; you can paddle your own canoe henceforth."

This is not the proposition suggested by the President in his message. Indeed, his suggestion was a reduction of the tariff and in such a manner as not to hurt or interfere with any American industry. He recognized the fact that it was to be a reduction of tariff and not a reciprocity measure. Reciprocity, as indicated by the President, is the handmaiden of protection; reciprocity begins where protection leaves off. It is an exchange of commodities produced by the United States, raised or made, for commodities not made or raised in the United States, with some other nation or power which has such commodities to exchange for those not made or produced by itself. The power of the President to bring about reciprocal agreements for trade is defined and set out in the Dingley law. And we have not been asked to instruct the President as to our views upon reciprocity with Cuba. And under the present bill the whole matter has dwindled to such small, narrow, and mean proportions as to hardly be worthy of serious consideration. Valueless to the United States, valueless to Cuba, if not even more—a humiliation. I had rather support a measure for absolute free trade between the two countries than to lend my indorsement to a measure which has dwindled into the insignificance surrounding this. It seems that the committee was willing to come down by degrees from 50 per cent to 20 per cent. It is a good deal like the proposition concerning Porto Rico before the last Congress. It is not the amount nor the result but the principle involved, the desire of some men to have their own way.

Now, how does this happen? As I understand it, Cuba has no local taxes or little if any. She has a little land tax, a little personal-property tax. Cuba lives on the internal revenue and on the customs and duties that are paid on goods that come in there. Now, suppose that all that Cuba receives she receives from the United States and we reduced that 20 per cent, then we reduce the revenue—we reduce what Cuba has to live and exist upon—20 per cent. She has 20 per cent less, that much less with which, if she gets all the products from us, to carry on her government. In other words, instead of this stimulating any trade between Cuba and the United States, Cuba's interest lies in the direction of buying somewhere else, buying from some country where they will get a larger amount of revenue, instead of buying from our country, where her revenues are reduced 20 per cent. Now, such is the law in its general scope.

I want to say that as far as I am concerned, and I think I speak the sentiment of my people, I am just as much disinterested in this subject as the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, and more so. Indeed, he is perfectly safe; the beet-sugar factory in his district which he has so often mentioned will not suffer, for his State has just passed a law fixing a bounty upon the production of sugar. I believe I can speak judiciously upon this proposition. There is not a beet-sugar factory in my district, and but a few sugar beets are raised there. No man in this House will go further than I will in generosity to help the bright young republic on her way to peace and plenty, on her way to add another star to the blue field of Old Glory. [Applause.] We are willing to help Cuba whether she is suffering or not. And we all rejoice that the suffering and misery seen there by my colleague, Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH, when he was there, has passed away, and we hope has passed away forever. This is plainly shown by all the proofs before the committee. My people believe, and I believe, that this is such a patriotic duty, such a patriotic pleasure, that every American—man, woman, and child, young and old, North and South, East and West—would like to have a hand in the good and generous deed. Make it a national affair, take the money from the Treasury and hand it to the real Cubans, not to the Spaniards, not to the rich planters, not to the sugar trusts. Bestow charity where charity is needed. I believe that the sentiment in my district is in favor of doing something for Cuba, and I believe that if we do something for Cuba we ought to do it in a royal way, we ought to do it in a manly way, we ought to do it in such a manner as that the blush of shame shall not come to the face of the Cuban when he receives it.

I tell you you can give alms to a beggar on the street in such a way that you will make him feel like a prince, and you can give a gift to a prince in such a way as to make him feel like a beggar. I have seen fathers give gifts or money to their children, intending to give it to them all the while, in such a manner as that it takes all the pleasure out of the gift and out of the receiving of the gift. Even some men treat their wives that way. [Laughter.]

They hang on to it and give it to them grudgingly. I heard a great orator say when you get ready to give a dollar, let it go; spend your money in a royal way; spend it as though every leaf on every tree were a greenback and you owned an unlimited forest. [Laughter.] That is the sentiment of my district about Cuba—to give it with a free hand, give them something so they will know they are getting it and so it will do some good. But the sentiment of my district is in opposition to giving anything to the sugar trust or any other trust combination. [Applause.]

According to my views, a Congressman represents his district and, in a sense, the interests of his State. In what I shall say I shall not attribute to any member anything but the noblest and best motives. And I was very pleased to hear the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] say, what must have been understood by all, that no man should be criticised or his faith questioned because he honestly and conscientiously took the one side or the other of this proposition. When it comes to a question of following or failing to follow the lead of chosen leaders, right or wrong, as a test of political integrity, then is our party and then is our country in danger. In these days of combine and combinations the danger is the loss of the thinking, independent, responsible man.

We are for Cuba and we are for the Department of Agriculture, and for the opinion of Secretary Wilson as against the opinion and policies of Mr. Havemeyer or the sugar trust. [Applause.]

Secretary Wilson says that inside of five years—and he made this statement before the Committee on Agriculture, of which I have the honor to be a member—the richness of the sugar beet will be increased over 20 per cent, and he said:

I believe as certainly as I am standing here that inside of five years, if the sugar-beet industry is not interfered with, the United States will produce all the sugar that the United States can use.

Mr. Havemeyer says:

Give me a free hand, let me alone, let me have my way, pass such laws as I dictate, and inside of five years I will wipe the sugar-beet business off from the face of the earth.

As my friend from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] just said—and a Democrat is just as right as anyone else when he is right, the only trouble with the Democrat is that he is never right; at the right time [laughter]—but he was right in this when he said that Havemeyer said he did not care who it hurt.

Now, while that is in my mind, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] was appealing to the House and asking if we would join him in putting down the trust. I want to say to my friend that we will join him in putting down the trusts if he will follow out the suggestion of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NAPHEN], a Democrat from the bright and intelligent city of Boston, providing for an amendment to the Federal Constitution giving the Congress of the United States the right to pass laws regulating and controlling trusts. Mr. NAPHEN introduced that resolution in the Fifty-sixth Congress and it was put to sleep by the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber. A Republican member reported the resolution out of the committee, and I remember well that when the resolution was called only one Democrat on the other side had the manhood to stand up and vote in favor of amending the Constitution permitting Congress to regulate trusts.

I am one of the infant statesmen—one of the "sophomores." I am not one of the chosen leaders of the party. But I will tell you what I will do; I will vote for it. But you better quit using barbed-wire fence. Come to Adrian and get some Lamb woven-wire fence, Page steel-wire fence, not made nor controlled by the trusts, but standing above the trust and defying it.

Mr. COCHRAN: Have you any idea that a majority of your party would so vote?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I can not speak on that proposition. But I see that my time is fast going, and I must hurry on.

I do not want to say anything unkind of anyone. I do not intend to criticise this committee. But I wish to say that I am not one of those who believe that the Republican party is going to wreck and ruin. I can not see those ghosts that my friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] saw coming up over the footboard and which he held up here to warn us—Democratic spooks! [Laughter.] He warned us of the possibility of Democratic victory—of the danger of our pitching into the Administration. He told us that every vote against this measure was a vote against the President. And he said that my friend and colleague, WM. ALDEN SMITH, as well as myself, was not "dry behind the ears." [Laughter.] Well, I will tell you one thing: I would rather be in that condition than dry in front of the ears or dry over the ears. [Laughter.] It is true we are young; and the gentleman from New York accused me of not having been here long. I am not to blame for that. I came here just as soon as the people would let me come. [Laughter.] And when I asked him a question, he said "Go 'way back and sit down; you are young and vealish."

Mr. PAYNE rose.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I am always glad to listen to the gentleman. He is my Congressman. I am proud of him. I am always glad to act with him when I think he is right, just as he is glad to act with the President when he thinks the President is right, and is ready to oppose him when he thinks he is wrong.

But I have always heard it is a good thing, when we are in doubt, to "search the Scriptures"—that good old book that we all read at our mother's knee—the book that is able to guide us aright in every path of life. That is my sheet anchor. On Sunday last I took this book down, and I began to look over these "vealish" statements, these sophomorical addresses, these college orations of these embryo statesmen. Do you know that the Saviour of the world was accused of that same thing of which the gentleman from New York has accused us here? He lived only thirty-three years on this earth. Had he appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and attempted to suggest any changes in the policy of that committee he would have been instructed by my friend from New York to "go 'way back and sit down." [Laughter.] And the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] would have said, "Me, too."

Was it not remarkable that the gentleman from Ohio said:

I would not stand 50 per cent; I would not stand 40 per cent; I would not stand 25 per cent; but 20 per cent, that is just exactly the figure which will not hurt the sugar business at home and will help the Cubans.

Is not that a little remarkable? Why, gentlemen, this great committee came within 5 per cent of losing the support of the gentleman from Ohio. I tell you gentlemen, it was a close call. Talk about your "divine ratio" of 16 to 1. Here we have an equally divine percentage—just 20 per cent. [Applause.]

But I must come back to what I was just about to read from the Scriptures:

Purge out, therefore, the old leaven, that ye may be a new paste, as ye are unleavened.

Therefore let us feast, not with old leaven nor with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.

[Applause.]

As I just said, I am not alarmed about the future of the Republican party in Michigan. Our Republicanism is rock rooted, as firm as our everlasting hills, as enduring as our wealth of mineral, as constant as our inland seas, which surround her as a zone of beauty. Why, the Republican party was born in Michigan—born in my district. Under the oaks at Jackson, in nature's cathedral, 'mid the songs of birds and the fragrance of flowers, our party was born. It was a birth of purity, and pure the party will continue. [Applause.]

Now, before I close I want to refer to what was said here in regard to my friend and colleague, WM. ALDEN SMITH. Let me say, gentlemen, there is nothing to be made by abusing us young fellows. We are going to be old some day. You are not going to get any converts by calling us pettifoggers and "embryo statesmen," or by telling us to "go 'way back and sit down." Nor is it necessary that you suggest to us that you will not let us stay here; that we are going to be defeated if we do not follow your lead and do what you suggest. Gentlemen, there is nothing to be made by heaping—I do not want to say abuse, but by using such language or terms as were used in regard to my brother and colleague, WM. ALDEN SMITH.

I always feel ready to defend and stand up for the Smith family. [Applause.] You know that in the Garden of Eden, when all were pure and sinless, the Lord said "We will start this thing right; we will call everybody Smith; and then, as soon as they begin to go wrong, we will call them PAYNE, or DALZELL, or something of that kind." [Laughter.]

But my friend here was mistaken when he talked about WM. ALDEN SMITH delivering a college oration that he had committed to memory. I want to tell you something about the college at which he graduated. He graduated in the school of common sense, in the school of experience, and he took a post-graduate course in the school of hard knocks. [Applause.]

A townsman, a neighbor of mine, when he was United States marshal of the State of Michigan, found that boy a barefooted boy selling newspapers and popcorn on the streets of a great city, supporting his widowed mother, and he was fascinated with him. He took an interest in him and got his mother's consent to take him to Lansing, the capital of the State of Michigan, had him appointed a page, and that boy went on from page to messenger, from messenger to clerk, from clerk to lawyer, from lawyer to business man, until he owns a block in the city of Grand Rapids and has been the general counsel of one of the largest railroads in this country, and he won his way unaided to the Congress of the United States. [Applause.] Without one hand to uplift or aid he came here, and by and by—he is a young man yet, but he is growing—when he gets dry behind the ears [laughter], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] will love, respect, and honor him as the State of Michigan loves, respects, and honors him today. [Applause.]

But as I was saying, this is a terribly little thing when you come to get down to it, isn't it? What is there left for a lot of big men, able-bodied men, a great committee of this House, to be bothered with? There is a question as to whether any Cuban planter will ever get one penny of benefit from this; and I want to say to you that if this was a Democratic measure in a Democratic House, originating on the other side of the Chamber as it naturally would, being a Democratic measure as I believe, I would like to hear my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and my friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], and all these other gentlemen, ridiculing it out of the House. Do you know, every time I think of it my attention is called to this poem of Frank L. Stanton's, which I will read:

Sich a li'l' feller, en he settin' up so wise!
Say he like his daddy, but he got his mammy's eyes;
Angel tuk and drap him furr a window in de skies—
By-bye, honey, twell de mawuin'.
Sich a li'l' feller, in de cunnin'es' er close!
Say he love his daddy, but his mammy's what he knows!
Foun' him in de springtime, and dey tuck him fer a rose—
By-bye, honey, twell de mawuin'.
Sich a li'l' feller, en he talkin' like a man!
By-bye, by-bye, kiss yo' li'l' han';
Lots er li'l' chillun in de sleepy lan'—
By-bye, honey, twell de mawuin'.

[Applause.]

That, my friends, is just about what the Cubans will think of this wonderful proposition, if it ever gets down there, in my judgment. But they say, and the reason they urge it here, is because they say the President of the United States wants it.

The friends of this measure try to get support for it on the claim that the President has his heart set upon its passage, and the friends of the bill have said that a vote against it is a vote against the President, and a vote against it is a slap at the Administration. I deny both. I deny that the President is tenacious about this bill.

Now, gentlemen, I want to submit that I deny that he wants it. I deny that it is at his heart to urge this, and I say that, according to my judgment, President Roosevelt is too grand, too noble, and too patriotic to ever attempt to force legislation through this body the way it is intimated; and if there is no other reason why this should become a law than that the President of the United States wants it, it ought not to become a law.

Why, gentlemen, there are three branches to this Government; but I want to say, in passing, that when the next presidential election comes you will find that no Democratic Congressmen come from Michigan; that we send back 12 Republicans all the time. You will find Michigan standing elbow to elbow with Ohio and Pennsylvania and with any other Republican State for the Republican platform and the Republican candidates. [Applause.] We can fight and kiss and make up. [Laughter.] We are for harmony. I was about to say that there are three branches to this Government, which I learned early; there ought to be anyhow.

Mr. BARTLETT. Used to be.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Used to be in the old Constitution. [Laughter.] Now, we, as one of those branches, make the laws, and we do not make the laws the President of the United States tells us to make. We make the laws that our judgment dictates; the laws that our reason tells us are the proper laws. Then those laws go over to the Supreme Court and that court interprets the law, and after the law is made by us and interpreted by the court the Executive enforces the law. Now, what is his power under the Constitution? and I want to submit it to you. I read from article 2, section 3:

He shall from time to time give to the Congress—

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the gentleman think the Constitution is good Republican doctrine?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Certainly; and there is just this difference between you and me about that. We stick to the real Constitution. "The spirit of the law maketh alive," as that same good book says, "but the letter of the law killeth," and it is the letter of the law that you follow. A Democrat was on a boat one time, going across the ocean with his wife, and there was a great storm arose, which swept over the deck. Somehow or other, when they left home they thought it would be convenient to take along the marriage certificate—did not know but some question might be asked. And by and by the storm swept his wife overboard. He was on deck, and they were trying to fish her out, and finally the case seemed to be desperate, and he said, "Mr. Sailor, if you can not save my wife, for God's sake save the marriage certificate." [Laughter.] That is what you say, that you want just the certificate, just the letter of the law, the letter of the Constitution. Now, what does this say?

He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend—

That is all, just recommend—recommend for their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

Now, this is one of the things that he judged to be necessary and one of the things that he judges to be expedient.

Now he has recommended another thing that he thinks is necessary and that he judges to be expedient, the irrigation of the arid lands. I ask whether our leaders here will report out any bill for the irrigation of arid lands? I want to say that that is a proposition which is as near the President's heart as any other that he mentions in his message.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman does not seem to know that that irrigation bill has already been reported.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Oh, well, reporting it does not amount to anything. You will never bring it to a vote. Reporting it is a harmless entertainment.

Mr. PAYNE. It does not belong to our committee.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Certainly not. There will be some way of shutting it out. It does not belong to your committee; but the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has the right to bring in any kind of a rule which will even make water run up hill and irrigate all the arid lands of the Far West. [Laughter.] But I just want to make a prediction. This is one of these ghosts that my friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] speaks about peeping up over the footboard of my bed. That ghost, in my judgment, is that that arid-land proposition of the President will never see the light of day in this Congress, and if it does there will not be five men on this side of the Rocky Mountains who will vote for it. Now, the gentleman is just like the rest of us—just exactly. When he thinks the President is right, then he is with him. When he thinks he is not right, the gentleman is not with him; and that is just exactly my proposition. The President does not represent my district. I wish he did. He could get a nomination up there to-day, even with this beet-sugar agitation. There is no question about that.

And I say, too, that I believe the President of the United States repudiates the use of his name and the use of the argument that he desires the passage of this bill and the use of such statements for the purpose of inducing members of this House to support this measure, and I protest against the use of such means to bolster up this proposition. It shows the weakness of the cause, the weakness of the supporters of this measure, when the great leaders of the party in this House, who have led the party for all these years and shaped the policy of our Government for the eternal good of the race, must now make appeal to the President and ask him by his influence to lobby their bill through; and appeal to the Speaker of the House, to whom members are daily under obligation, and to warn them that they will lose their river and harbor appropriation and their pet measures in which their constituents are interested, as we see, stated in the newspapers and not denied.

Appeal to the chairmen of other committees, and even angle across the aisle of this Chamber for support from the Democratic side; and the newspapers state that the Crumpacker resolution for an investigation of the Southern election frauds may sleep the sleep that knows no waking if the Congressmen from the States where the investigation is to take place will only rally to the support of this bill which the Cubans repudiate, which the friends of the measure state will do no good, and which can not result in benefit to the United States. The proposition will not stand alone. It must be bolstered up by influence. It can not go through on its merits.

Ninety per cent of the Republicans in this House, away down in the bottom of their honest hearts, unbiased and uninfluenced by the means and influences I have mentioned, repudiate the measure. They say so openly, shamefaced. The only excuse they make for supporting it is that they must follow the committee; that they do not want to be out of harmony with the leaders; that it is uncomfortable to dwell in a tent where there is a want of harmony.

The same tactics were used to pass the Porto Rican bill in the last Congress. Members of Congress were asked by the leaders to go and see the President. They visited him until President McKinley, noblest of the dead or the living, was driven from his "plain duty" as he saw it, and as he penned it in his message on parchment, in unfading ink, to last forever. And he did it all in the interest of party harmony. And now, not content to appeal to the President, to appeal to the Speaker, to appeal to chairmen of committees to bring in the members of their committee, to appeal to Democrats on the other side, appeal is also made to the memory of the dead President to induce support to the measure. In the name of all that is sacred, what argument is there in all of this?

In the language of Shakespeare—

When went there by a day before when one who spoke of Rome could say, There dwells within her walls only one man?

It is not a question of House rules; it is a question of ourselves. Under the rules of the House we have the power to prevent the

consideration of any measure. It is simply a question of backbone—a question of having as much stability as a piece of boneless liver.

Another proposition, another reason for the support of the bill, another ghost held up, urged by the committee, urged by the witnesses who live in Boston and other large cities, in million-dollar mansions, who own sugar plantations in Cuba, or sugar-refinery stock here, urged by the president of the new republic, who does not live there but who contemplates going down to be inaugurated, and contemplates, if his business interests will permit and he can leave his New Jersey home and business, serving them for one year, is that the United States has some duty to perform and is under some obligation because of the Platt amendment attached to their constitution. I quote that amendment, as follows:

That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes or otherwise lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

And I submit that there is not one word in that amendment that in any manner hampers Cuba in her commercial relations with any country in this world. It simply provides that she shall not enter into any treaty which will impair her independence or permit any foreign power to obtain control over the island.

Another thing urged is that President McKinley made some kind of a promise, but the proofs before the hearing show that the President told them that he had no power to make such promise.

The proof before the committee showed that there was no suffering in the island of Cuba, but that, on the contrary, Cuba had never experienced such prosperity as she was now enjoying. It is said that the best witness is a confessing litigant. Upon this question I am content to quote from the report made by the committee which favors this bill. On page 2 of that report it is stated:

Since the war, under our administration, she has recuperated in a wonderful degree. During the past three years her great industry, the production of sugar, has multiplied threefold.

Now, I want to submit that if the farmers and the other business men of the United States have increased their business threefold in the past three years, and if the laboring man in this country has during that time improved his condition threefold, then certain it is that we have prospered in this country under protection to the American farmer, protection to the American manufacturer, and protection to American interests "far beyond the dreams of avarice."

Again, on the same page in that report it is stated that—

It is true that labor in Cuba is, and for the past three months has been, fully employed at fair wages; that there has been no famine or distress.

And it appeared in the hearings that common farm laborers received from \$23 to \$26 per month and board; that there was not a man in Cuba willing to work who could not be employed and at better wages than ever before paid in the history of that land.

The statement of Mr. Machado, sugar planter of Cuba, on page 445 of the hearings, is as follows:

The statement has been made here that all our laborers are employed at good wages and that therefore there can be no misery in Cuba. There lies precisely the reason why Cuba can not make much more sugar than it is making now. We have not population enough to attend to cane growing and manufacturing, the cultivation of other articles like tobacco and vegetables, and the breeding of cattle to a greater extent than these things are done today, and that is why our laborers are all employed at high wages. To grow the present amount of cane some 500,000 acres of land must be cultivated. One man can not attend to more than 3 acres on an average, and there you have already 150,000 men employed. To double our crop we must have 300,000 laborers in the field, working only in cane. Where are these men in a country of about one and a half millions inhabitants all told?

This is a rosy picture, and also shows what I have before said, that if Cuba is to pass such laws as that she then can not develop and add to her population; her progress will be retarded.

And in the report of the committee, on page 4, it is stated that it is impossible for Cuba to increase her production of sugar—unless she was able to import more laborers. For this reason the requirement was placed in the bill that she should adopt immigration and exclusion laws as restrictive as our own laws on these subjects.

Let us briefly review the witnesses who appeared before the committee favoring reciprocity. They are as follows:

E. F. Atkins, Boston, Mass., representing American associated interests of Cuba; C. P. Armstrong, of the New York Produce Exchange; Col. T. H. Bliss, collector of the port of Habana, Cuba; W. R. Corwine, representing the Merchants' Association in New York; R. B. Hawley, representing American and Cuban sugar interests; Howell, Son & Co., sugar commission merchants, New York; Hugh Kelley, New York, sugar merchant; National Sugar Refining Company; Charles Rabadan, New York Produce Exchange; Evan Thomas, ex-president same; F. B. Thurber, president United States Export Association; L. V. De Abad, of Cuba, civil engineer; F. P. Macado, planter; Miguel Mendoza, of Habana, planter; Louis V. Place, sugar commission merchant, and sugar planters of the provinces of Santiago and Puerto Principe,

who are represented by Mosle Brothers, of New York, as their agents.

Those against reciprocity take up nearly three pages in the index, and they are all producers—Americans interested in this American product. The iniquity of the whole thing and the evil of it, to my mind, is the false claims and pretenses as to the purpose of the act. Above and beyond all the rest is the rule handed down on the tables of stone, "Thou shalt not bear false witness."

Since this measure can be of no benefit to us, for it is conceded by every man who has spoken in favor of it, by the report of the committee which urges it, by everyone who has looked into the subject, that by reason of the passage of this bill sugar will not be a farthing cheaper to anyone who consumes it; and since it can not be of benefit to Cuba, why should it become a law? Simply and solely to carry out the proposition of the Ways and Means Committee, which is generally conceded to have been a mistake, just simply to permit certain men to have their own way. If there is any other reason, it has not been stated. If there is no other reason the bill ought not to pass.

The Louisville Courier Journal on March 21 expressed what must be the fair sense of all, wherein it said: "A 20 per cent reduction is insignificant enough, but to limit even that to a period of less than two years is little better than a mockery. It is a contemptible piece of hypocrisy and cowardice."

And a paper in my own district, the Jackson Press, on March 19 puts the proposition about right, as follows: "The 20 per cent cut is insufficient and the immigration suggestion is impudent."

And I want to quote in full an article from the Jackson Citizen, edited by ex-Congressman O'Donnell, who represented that district in this body on the Republican side with honor, ability, and fidelity. The article is so clear that I desire to read it in full, as follows:

THE HYPOCRISY OF RECIPROCITY.

It almost makes one tired to realize the influences and underhand efforts made to mislead the American mind on the subject of reciprocity. A great doctrinal principle, as enunciated, capable of good use if nursed and handled by a wise and prudent statesmanship, it has been perverted and manipulated until as now presented to the people, it is only an appeal to the cupidity on the one hand and a new demonstration and effort to accomplish a revival of free trade on the other. Ever since President McKinley uttered his speech favoring reciprocity as a matter of expediency to extend trade; ever since he asserted that it was "a plain duty" to admit Porto Rico to the unimpeded use of the whole American market, the acclaim of all importers and free traders has been for "reciprocity." Mr. McKinley spoke more as a philanthropist than as a statesman, and his philanthropy has been seized and magnified in the interest of greed and partisanship to the detriment of American prosperity.

The Citizen has, as a newspaper, been favored with dozens of circulars, letters, speeches, statements, and pamphlets favoring reciprocity. Some emanate from the importers of Boston and New York, some from the agricultural implement manufacturers at Chicago, but latterly they mostly come from the offices of the gigantic Havemeyer sugar trust and the great American tobacco combine. Their efforts are now directed to educating public sentiment into a critical stage of interest and sympathy with the down-trodden and suffering people of Cuba. Cut down the Dingley tariff on sugar and tobacco is the outcry, and save the suffering and starving people of Cuba. If you don't do it, loss, destruction, and starvation will follow and the United States will oppress them beyond the limits of Spanish robbery and spoliation. In our view this is naught but self-interest on the one hand and cheap political push on the other. Cuba is not suffering any more from the operations of tariff and trade to-day than for years ago only in the circulars of interested business men and cheap clap-trap politicians of the free-trade Democratic persuasion, sailing under false colors. The Havemeyers, the Thurburs, the Farquhars are flooding the country with their letters, circulars, and articles, and a part of the newspapers are copying them, as per request, or they are hiring them printed in the patent insides of newspaper publishing houses to influence public opinion. We have lying before us now no less than three of these appeals, with a P. S.—"If you think so, won't you write your Senators and Members of Congress to that effect and also give it continued support in your paper?"

No, gentlemen, we won't. This country has spent nearly a hundred millions and many lives to benefit Cuba. It has freed it from the taxes, extortions, and tyrannies of Spain. Cuba prefers independence to affiliation with the American people. Let her take her choice, and have all the privileges of independent peoples. We must, then, treat her as independent. She has no right to ask for any special privileges, no decreased tariff, no destroying of American industries to build up Cuban interests or to feed the cupidity and greed of American sugar and tobacco trusts. This whole effort to create sympathy for Cuba is only a deep-laid game to enrich capitalists at the expense of American industry and prosperity. Our Government and Congress owe their first duty to protect and benefit our own country and people, and the Senator or Representative who forgets that great and foremost economic fact is a traitor to American prosperity and his own constituency. Government is for justice, home, and domestic prosperity, and not for a simple and gushing sympathy for other people and nations. Politicians may exploit it for partisan advantage, and trusts may struggle for increased profits, but time will uncover the evil and lead to the same repentance the nation experienced in 1894. A reciprocity that benefits the American producers and laborers is the kind that we can all indorse, but a reciprocity that is selfish and promotes only private ends and interests is a perversion of good judgment and wise statesmanship, and will never be approved by the American public.

And in passing, let me inquire as to who has paid for all these newspaper articles and the pamphlets and literature referred to in this article appealing to us for nine months before Congress assembled? Certain it is that in the hearings before the committee and in all the investigations made not one utterance has been traced to any Cuban planter, not one word has been heard from any Cuban who anticipates getting any benefit from this law. On the other hand, many of the publications and utterances and

arguments have been traced to and the money to pay therefor has been shown to come from the coffers of the sugar trust, which my friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] intimated had caused me to see ghosts behind each fluttering leaf. I am quite ready to admit that I join the President in what he said in his speech at Charleston, which my friend from Ohio so warmly commended in his warning against the immense forces of capital now massed, and in his statement that the national welfare requires that the power of supervision and regulation over them ought to be exercised by this Government. If I might indulge the hope that some day I could become more familiar with the "strong box" of Mr. Havemeyer I might learn to look upon it with less fear and trembling.

I have no objection to people acquiring wealth, and in the language of an eloquent friend of mine in Michigan, I am still willing that there should be another millionaire in the world, and I am a candidate for the place. At the same time, it is humiliating that a great trust should control 90 per cent of the sugar we must all use—absolutely control the price and the market. One of the representatives of the Bay City Company showed that when an old farmer came with his wagon to get some sugar for a country merchant at their place he had to wait until they could call up Mr. Havemeyer's agent in Chicago on the long-distance telephone to find out what they would be permitted to sell sugar in Michigan that morning. It was then 10 o'clock, and the Bay City man was told that Mr. Havemeyer had not yet had his breakfast, and did not get down to the office until 11 o'clock. So the farmer had to hitch his horses and wait until the coffee of the sugar-trust magnate cooled and he had reached his office at 11 o'clock.

There is no doubt but what this same committee a year ago understood that if the tariff was reduced on sugar the trust would get the benefit, for in report No. 1766 upon a resolution to put Porto Rican and Cuban sugar on the free list that committee stated that it would be a gift of the amount of \$1,200,000 to the sugar trust.

But whether the trust will get this or not, and we ought not to pass a law which would leave any doubt upon the subject, the Agricultural Department has spent a lot of money to develop the sugar-beet interest; it is a protection from which the farmer derives a direct benefit. Michigan to-day makes 80 per cent of all the sugar she uses; in the course of a few years the United States can produce from the beet all the sugar she can consume.

We sent away \$444,000 of agricultural products last year, sent away to foreign markets and brought back to this country money from foreign lands therefor. This picture is marred some by the fact that we brought into this country during the same time \$222,000,000 of farm products, over \$100,000,000 of which we paid for sugar, which we sent away to other countries never to come back. I believe it is the duty of Congress to stimulate this business, to keep this money at home.

The gentleman from Ohio, Mr. GROSVENOR, intimated that platforms were not very sacred, that they were made in a night; and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MCCALL, said that they were an expedient—or that, in effect, was his argument—like a car platform, to get in on. I can not believe that this is the opinion of people generally, and I know that such are not the sentiments of the Republicans of Michigan.

When Mr. McKinley was elected President in the fall of 1896 business took a new life, and where a want of confidence and distrust existed business stability and forward march came, all on the faith and confidence the country had in Republican promises and Republican principles. And I know that \$10,000,000 has been invested in the sugar-beet business in Michigan, farms have been made more valuable, mortgages paid off, towns, villages, and cities have prospered. And I believe that this money was invested on the faith of the pledges and the principles of the Republican party. And I believe that we are in honor bound to stand by those pledges, hurt Havemeyer, help Cuba, or come what may. Fair play is a jewel. Right is mighty and will prevail.

Truth crushed to earth shall rise again;
The eternal years of God are hers;
But Error, wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies amid her worshippers.

[Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. LACEY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. SHERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12765) to provide for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:
To Mr. BURKE of South Dakota, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. THAYER, for ten days, on account of important business.

And then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE, and in accordance with the order heretofore made, the House (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 17, 1902, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for Columbia Hospital—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a memorial from the Cherokee Indians, together with a draft of a bill for the allotment of lands—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for military prison at Alcatraz, Cal.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Grant Statue or Memorial Commission, reporting progress and recommending an appropriation—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending an appropriation for protection of Orient Point (New York) light station—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13113) to authorize the Secretary of War to loan tents for the use of the Spanish War Veterans' encampment at Indianapolis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1641); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12867) to authorize the Shreveport Bridge and Terminal Company to construct and maintain a bridge across Red River, in the State of Louisiana, at or near Shreveport, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1642); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9503) to authorize the Oklahoma and Western Railroad Company to construct and operate a railway through the Fort Sill Military Reservation, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1643); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3153) to amend section 698 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1644); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES of Washington, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4355) authorizing the issuance of a patent to the county of Clallam, State of Washington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1645); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13278) granting an increase of pension to Levi H. Collins, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1621); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18296) granting an increase of pension to Francis Scott, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1622); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4509) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Knight, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1623); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5159) granting a pension to W. A. Miller, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1624); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2305) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel Grove, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1625); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6718) granting an increase of pension to Andrew R. Jones, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1626); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5865) granting an increase of pension to Col. James C. Campbell, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1627); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7618) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Sheridan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1628); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2805) granting an increase of pension to Anna L. Cory, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1629); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 319) granting a pension to Ida M. Warren, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1630); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 325) granting an increase of pension to John Compton, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1631); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8109) granting a pension to William H. McCarter, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1632); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3634) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Capehart, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1633); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8346) granting a pension to Mrs. Nannie C. Trammell, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1634); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10372) granting a pension to Ada S. Kempfer, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1635); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4381) granting an increase of pension to John S. Robinson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1636); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5192) granting an increase of pension to John English, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1637); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10794) granting a pension to Thomas H. Devitt, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1638); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11115) granting a pension to Angeline H. Taylor, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1639); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5183) granting a pension to William Holdridge, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1640); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9941) granting a pension to James Mathew, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 13677) providing for execution of official bonds by assistant postmasters and other officials and employees of the postal service and Postal Department—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BEIDLER: A bill (H. R. 13678) to authorize the President of the United States to take certain action in the selection of representatives for the consideration of proposed good-roads legislation—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 13679) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES (by request): A bill (H. R. 13680) granting lands in the Territory of New Mexico to aid in the construction of the Santa Fe Central Railway and the Albuquerque Eastern Railway, in said Territory, and in the construction of telegraph lines in connection therewith—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 13681) granting an appropriation to the trustees of the Woman's National Industrial Exhibit of the city of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MINOR: A bill (H. R. 13682) to amend section 4517 of the United States Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 13724) to regulate process and proceedings in the circuit courts of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAY: A resolution (H. Res. 213) asking for information from the Civil Service Commission—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A resolution (H. Res. 214) authorizing the Select Committee on Examination and Disposition of Documents to employ labor and clerical assistance—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 13683) granting an increase of pension to Ella S. Mannix—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW: A bill (H. R. 13684) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 13685) for the relief of Samuel B. Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13686) for the relief of Marion F. Wolfe—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CONRY: A bill (H. R. 13687) to correct the military record of John H. Lamson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 13688) for the relief of the North American Transportation and Trading Company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 13689) granting a pension to William W. Painter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 13690) granting a pension to Freeman R. Gove—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROW: A bill (H. R. 13691) granting an increase of pension to James M. Conrad—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 13692) granting a pension to Sarah Gentry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13693) granting an increase of pension to William T. Gans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13694) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia A. Burton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13695) granting an increase of pension to George W. Flory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13696) granting an increase of pension to Charles Wehr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACKSON of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 13697) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Page—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 13698) granting a pension to Mary A. Baldridge—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS: A bill (H. R. 13699) for the relief of the legal representatives of T. S. Grider, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MUTCHLER: A bill (H. R. 13700) for the relief of Amanda Sopris—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13701) granting a pension to Theodore Buri—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS of Maine: A bill (H. R. 13702) granting a pension to Phebe A. Flynn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHEA of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13703) for the relief of N. F. Palmer, jr., & Co., of New York—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 13704) granting a pension to Charlotte J. Closser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 13705) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Garrison—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TATE: A bill (H. R. 13706) granting a pension to Arelia C. Pool—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13707) for the relief of Andrew J. Sanders—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13708) for the relief of Enos M. Gribble—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 13709) granting an increase of pension to Elias Holliday—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 13710) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph R. Bell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 13711) for the relief of Simon M. Yates—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DARRAGH: A bill (H. R. 13712) granting a pension to Susan Sheldon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13713) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Randolph—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13714) granting an increase of pension to William C. Niles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13715) to correct the military record of Henry W. Knapp—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 13716) granting an increase of pension to Edward Cottingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13717) granting an increase of pension to John Gragan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13718) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Price—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 13719) granting a pension to Nancy McGuire—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 13720) for the relief of Jacob J. Miller—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 13721) for the relief of William Henley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 13722) granting a pension to Edd Lodge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13723) granting an increase of pension to Oliver C. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Resolution of the Trades League of Philadelphia, relating to House bill 7645, to maintain the legal-tender silver dollar at a parity with gold and to increase the subsidiary silver coinage—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Resolutions of Star Division, No. 323, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Augusta, Ga., favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Coupon petitions of 1,411 citizens of St. Louis, readers of the St. Louis Evening Star, asking Congressmen to vote for House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BEIDLER: Petition of Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church, New York, protesting against the passage of House bill 12543, for the admission of the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico to statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, resolutions of Subordinate Association No. 19 of Lithographers' International Protective and Beneficial Association, Coshocton, Ohio; Mine Workers' Union No. 550, of Wadsworth; Quarrymen's Union No. 9166, and Ship Carpenters' Union No. 9303, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BULL: Petition of the Central Trades and Labor Union of Rhode Island, in favor of the eight-hour bill, the anti-injunction bill, and the prison-labor bill—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolution of the Charity Organization Society of Newport, R. I., for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of the San Francisco (Cal.) Teachers' Meeting of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in favor of legislation for the benefit of naval chaplains—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURKETT: Petition of citizens of Harbor Springs, Mich., urging the passage of House bill 7475—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COWHERD: Petition of merchants and manufacturers of Kansas City, Mo., for reciprocal trade agreement with Canada—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DARRAGH: Paper accompanying House bill 6695, to remove charge of desertion from the military record of Moses Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the board of control of State House of Correction and Branch Prison at Marquette, Mich., opposing the passage of House bills 3143 and 5798 and other bills of a similar nature—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolutions of a meeting of Boer sympathizers in Milwaukee, Wis., in relation to the war in South Africa—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of Eighth Assembly Democratic District Association, of Brooklyn, N. Y., indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of Maritime Association of New York, favoring legislation to pension members of the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Merchants' Association of New York, for reciprocity with Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOWLER: Resolutions of Boiler Makers' Union No. 33, of Bayonne, N. J., and Painters and Paper Hangers' Union No. 223, Summit, N. J., favoring an educational test for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Cigar Makers' Union No. 427, of Rahway, N. J., against the reduction of duty on cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Division No. 85, of Trenton, and Division No. 74, of Elizabeth, N. J., Order of Railroad Telegraphers, favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Boiler Makers' Union No. 33, Bayonne, N. J., favoring the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of citizens of the Eleventh Congressional district of Ohio, in favor of House bills 178 and 179, for the repeal of the tax on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Scioto Lodge, No. 77, Association of Machinists, Chillicothe, Ohio, favoring an educational restriction on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HANBURY: Resolutions of the Merchants' Association of New York, urging reciprocity with Cuba upon the basis of not less than 40 per cent reduction—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also resolution of the Maritime Association of the Port of New

York, urging the passage of House bill 163, to pension employees and dependents of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of Machinists' Lodge No. 440, Rockford, Ill., for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: Resolution of Miller Post, No. 498, of Avon, Ind., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the construction of Government vessels in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Tailors' Union No. 31; Vigo Lodge, No. 16, Locomotive Firemen, of Terre Haute, and Mine Workers' Union No. 214, Brazil, Ind., against immigration from south and east of Europe—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KLUTTZ: Memorial of the Merchants' Association of New York, for reciprocity with Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Resolutions of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, urging the passage of House bill 163, to pension employees and dependents of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHONEY: Resolutions of At Last Lodge, No. 456, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Chicago, Ill., in support of the bill known as "the Foraker-Corliss safety-appliance bill"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of Harmonia Society of Chicago, Ill., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of At Last Lodge, No. 456, of Chicago, Ill., Railroad Trainmen, favoring the passage of the Foraker-Corliss safety-appliance bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN: Resolutions of the Western South Dakota Stock Growers' Association, in opposition to the passage of the Henry oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the same association, favoring the passage of House bill No. 6565, known as the Grosvenor pure-fiber bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of Merchants' Association of New York, in favor of reciprocity with Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEVIN: Petition of Mutual Lodge, No. 225, Association of Machinists, favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PATTERSON: Resolutions of John Ennis Post, No. 47, St. Clair, Pa., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring a bill providing pensions to certain officers and men in the Army and Navy of the United States when 50 years of age and over, and increasing widows' pensions to \$12 per month—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, resolution of Mine Workers' Union No. 1685, Shenandoah, Pa., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany House bill 13310, granting a pension to Anna McGowan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: Paper to accompany House bill 13588, granting an increase of pension to Justus A. Chafee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS of Maine: Paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Phebe A. Flynn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of citizens of Kansas for the recognition of the South African Republic and the Orange Free State—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Protest of Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church, against the passage of House bill 12543, for the admission of the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico to Statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. TATE: Papers to accompany House bill 11395, granting a pension to Mary Pitman, widow of Capt. W. D. Pitman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Arelia C. Pool, widow of Haden S. A. Pool—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill 13707, granting a pension to Andrew J. Sanders—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of the heirs of Joseph R. Bell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VREELAND: Resolutions of Steel Cabinet Workers' Union, of Jamestown, and Trades and Labor Union, of Olean, N. Y., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 17, 1902.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CLAY, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved. It is approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MALLORY presented a petition of Local Union No. 74, Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Pensacola, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a petition of the Board of Trade and Transportation of New York, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation allowing the payment of a drawback in cases where certain imported materials can not be positively identified, provided like materials of at least the same value have been used in the manufacture of the exported articles; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a petition of Vigo Lodge, No. 16, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Terre Haute, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to exclude Chinese laborers from the United States and their insular possessions; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Kokomo Lodge, No. 463, International Association of Machinists, of Kokomo, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of Tecumseh Lodge, No. 402, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Lafayette, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the adoption of any substitute therefor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Samuel Blaemire and 59 other citizens of Hobart, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the internal-revenue law relative to the tax on distilled spirits; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented a petition of Horse Nail Workers' Local Union No. 9487, of Vergennes, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CLARK of Montana presented a memorial of 30 citizens of Lewis and Clarke County, Mont., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the leasing of the public domain; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. RAWLINS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Utah; of sundry citizens of southern Utah; of sundry citizens of Mohave County, Ariz., and of sundry citizens of Fredonia, Ariz., praying for the annexation to Utah of that portion of the Territory of Arizona lying north of the Colorado River; which were referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of Lodge No. 621, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Boston, Mass., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the adoption of any substitute therefor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DEPEW presented the memorial of Levi Copeland and 36 other citizens of West Hebron, N. Y., remonstrating against the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Republican district committee of the twenty-eighth assembly district of New York County, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Congress Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the pay of letter carriers; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Ship Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 9298, of Elm Park; of Pressmen's Local Union No. 9331, of Lockport; of the Trades Assembly of Norwich; of United Neckwear Cutters' Local Union No. 6939, of New York City; of Laborers' Protective Union No. 9512, of Ticonderoga; of Hudson River Lodge, No. 365, of Troy, and of Loyal Lodge, No.